EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BEHIND THE SCENES, PERHAPS A COUP

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 1983

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, a committee on which I proudly serve, has been working for many months on a legislative package authorizing funds for the International Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank, Multilateral Development Banks, and most especially, funding for desperately needed housing programs.

When the 98th Congress convened, prospects for comprehensive housing legislation were remote. As a result of the Herculean efforts of the chairman of the Banking Committee, FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, the Congress will be able to pass a meaningful housing program which recognizes the needs of low- and moderate-income families.

In yesterday's New York Times, Jonathan Fuerbringer reports in an article entitled "Behind the Scenes, Perhaps a Coup" on Chairman ST GERMAIN's masterful leadership. I commend this article to my colleagues attention.

[From the New York Times, Tuesday Nov. 15, 1983]

BEHIND THE SCENES, PERHAPS A COUP

(By Jonathan Fuerbringer)

WASHINGTON, Nov. 14—Representative Fernand J. St Germain of Rhode Island looks like the shrewd, inside politician he is. The son of a millworker from Woonsocket, R.I. is not slick and telegenic but short and stocky with a ruddy face and a walk that is almost pugnacious.

What is more, he prefers to work behind the scenes. "He dosen't believe in sunlight," said a fellow Congressman who knows him well.

At the moment, Mr. St Germain has an opportunity to pull off a coup that many other Democrats have not been able to. He may be able to force President Reagan to swallow a Democratic housing bill that means more spending.

Mr. St Germain has played a cagey game with the Administration all year, using its need to win approval of an $8.4-billion increase in the United States contribution to the International Monetary Fund to open the way for voting on the first housing bill in three years.

He managed to get the original I.M.F. bill through the House on a vote of 217 to 211 in August and then linked it to his $15.6-billion housing bill. He had gotten the housing bill through the House earlier by saying that it had to pass before a vote would be taken on the I.M.F. bill.

The Senate approved the I.M.F. bill earlier last summer and the entire package is now being hammered out by the Administration, the Senate Banking Committee and Mr. St Germain.

"AN UPHILL BATTLE"

"We still have an uphill battle," the Congressman said in an interview, relishing the strategic victories he has won so far. Mr. St Germain still needs final agreement on the housing bill from the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, Jake Garn, a Utah Republican. But Mr. Garn said today, "We have most of the major provisions worked out."

Mr. St Germain, who is chairman of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, is hoping to being the final package to the House floor this week where he figures the votes for housing will be enough to offset the strong opposition among Republicans and Democrats to the increase in the I.M.F. funding.

"He's one of the smartest political operatives in this place," said Representative Charles E. Schumer, a Brooklyn Democrat and a member of the Banking Committee. Representative Barney Frank of Massachusetts, another Democratic member of the committee, said Mr. St Germain's strategy worked so well that "he played more the role of a broker rather than the extortionist."

Mr. St Germain, a 53-year-old lawyer, has a special interest in housing. He points with pride to the fact that his district has the highest concentration of housing for the elderly in the nation. His voting record is liberal and pro-labor.

WORKING AT THE AGE OF 12

While seen as a supporter of the savings and loan industry, Mr. St Germain is not though to be a fan of commercial banks, especially the big ones. But he says that is "a fiction."

"Being from the background I'm from—my father was a millworker and I started to work when I was 12 years old—intially I had a tendency to favor the thrifts."

The Banking Committee, with 47 members the third largest standing committee in Congress, has had its share of famous chairmen, including Wright Patman, the late Texas Congressman. After 20 years in the House, Mr. St Germain succeeded Representative Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin in 1981.

He is a loner and can be rough or curt, but he appears to be liked by committee members, both liberal and conservative, because he takes care of them.

"He gives me enough room," said Representative Buddy Roemer, a conservative Democrat from Louisiana who opposes both the monetary fund bill as it stands and the housing measure. "he lets me know early enough where he is going and he allows me to develop some positions. Then he lets me lose."

"NOT A MAN TO CROSS"

"I'd rather than a chairman who was strong than one who lets me get in too deep and finds out I'm all alone, said Mr. Roemer, whose only complaint is that Mr. St Germain has not moved ahead on new legislation to deregulate banking and other financial institutions.

Some lobbyists, however, have a slightly different view. But those who criticize Mr. St Germain do it off the record, saying he is "not a man to cross" or that he is heavy-handed. But even these critics acknowledge that the bills he has produced are generally good ones.

The I.M.F. bill shows how the Congressman works. When Mr. St Germain went to the White House earlier this year to say that the housing bill would have to be voted on before he would move the I.M.F. bill to the floor, he had already decided that he would tie both measures together for a final vote. But he told nobody, not even his staff.

"In the legislative process I've found that I have to play it very close to the vest for a period of time," he said. "Because the minute you telegraph your punch you've lost your potential impact."

Then when the housing bill got through, Mr. St Germain went to work on the I.M.F. bill, which narrowly passed after several last minute compromises to attract Democratic votes. "You can call me landslide Freddy," said Mr. St Germain.

THE PRESIDENT APOLOGIZED

Then he got some help from an unexpected quarter. The National Republican Congressional Committee attacked Democrats who had voted for the I.M.F. bill but opposed an amendment that would block loans to "Communist dictatorships." The attack infuriated Democrats who pointed out that the Republican leadership in the House and the Administration also opposed the amendment. They said they would withhold support for the I.M.F. bill until they got an apology from the President.

Mr. Reagan did apologize, but the episode left Mr. St Germain in a better position to win Administration concession on the housing bill.

"When they did that," said Mr. St Germain, referring the attack on Democrats, "they played into my hands even further because they made the I.M.F. bill even more difficult to sell."

Mr. St Germain chuckles when asked about his methods. To the suggestion that he has broken the arms of a few Congressmen in his day, he said, "I usually talk to them and make them aware of what the ultimate goal is and what the ultimate good is."●

PARKINSON'S DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 1983

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce House Joint Resolution 432, designating the week of April 8 through April 14, 1984, as

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

"Parkinson's Disease Awareness Week."

Parkinson's disease is a neurological disorder affecting the centers of the brain which control movement. Its cause is unknown. There is no known cure. Because the disease is not reported, we do not even know for certain how many Americans are afflicted.

We do know that the incidence of Parkinson's Disease increases with age, and that as our population ages more Americans will become its victims. Additional research is necessary to find a cure and improve treatment for Parkinson's disease. Programs are needed to help the victims of Parkinson's and their families better understand this disease and cope with its disabling effects.

Mr. Speaker, passage of House Joint Resolution 432 will promote the public awareness necessary to spur such actions.

I urge all Members to join with me in supporting this important legislation.

I insert a copy of House Joint Resolution 432 in the RECORD at this point:

H.J. RES. 432

Whereas Parkinson's Disease is a progressive and as yet incurable neurological affliction that affects 1 out of every 100 citizens over the age of 60 and whose cause is still unknown;

Whereas with improved methods of diagnosis, the onset of the disease is now being diagnosed as early as the age of 40 and younger;

Whereas with earlier diagnosis and the aging of our entire population, more and more of our citizens will be afflicted with Parkinson's Disease;

Whereas it is important to educate the public about the need for research into the cause and cure of this disabling disorder; and

Whereas only public awareness of the terrible toll taken by this neurological affliction can spur Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the private sector to establish the programs necessary to find a cure, improve treatment, and help those afflicted and their families to cope with this disabling disease: Now, therefore, be it.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of April 8 through 14, 1984, as "Parkinson's Disease Awareness Week", and to call upon Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.●

WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 1983

● Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the last several months have witnessed the greatest escalation of direct United States-Soviet tension since the Cuban missile crisis and the most hostile indirect confrontation in the Third World since the Vietnam war. American Armed Forces are now engaged in conflicts on two continents, with tensions mounting in the Strait of Hormuz, Korea, and at least two parts of Africa.

With proper alarm, we view the massive Soviet military buildup, the invasion of Afghanistan, the suppression of Solidarity in Poland, and the supply of arms to leftists in such disparate parts of the globe as Laos, Kampuchea, Angola, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. The Russians, in turn, perceive President Reagan as a "hardliner" and object strenuously to his recent categorization of Soviet society as the "focus of evil in the modern world." The President's criticisms of the Soviet Union have sparked a reaction in the Kremlin similar to that evoked in this country by Khrushchev's oft-remembered threat: "We shall bury you." From the Soviet perspective, U.S. intent to deploy Pershing and ground-launched cruise missiles in Europe represents an ominous escalation of the arms race. From ours, there is no responsible rationalization for the placement and upgrading of Soviet missiles in Eastern Europe.

But at the very moment when the prospect of direct confrontation seems to be growing, when warships are being sent ominously on maneuvers in the Caribbean and Mediterranean Seas, when new generations of missiles are about to be deployed and a new arms race started in space, significant factors for accommodation are also coalescing. The overkill redundance of United States and Soviet weaponry is now firmly established. Both sides possess a retaliatory capacity to annihilate most of the population of the other. This strategic parity which exists between the United States and the Soviet Union is unlikely to be broken in the next several generations. Accordingly, both powers have a self-interest in accommodation, that is, survival.

At this juncture in history the frailty of Yuri Andropov may be advantageous to the United States. Ever since Kennedy, American Presidents have been obsessed with the judgment of history. It would be naive to assume that Soviet leaders are immune from personal concern for historical assessment. Whether one be a liberal, a moderate, or a conservative in the American political context, a Communist, a Socialist, or capitalist in an international setting, the logic of our times dictates enhanced concern for arms control.

The Soviets may not like President Reagan; they may not want to reward him politically with arms control accords; but so many issues such as weaponization of space are so time-sensitive that we and they cannot afford to dally. Serious arms control cannot be put off for another decade, or perhaps even another administration, without risking a confrontation that may not be controllable. As an aging leader, Andropov is confronted with the historical opportunity to be a peacemaker rather than caretaker. Given the time difficulties the Soviet Union has in producing its Chief of State in succession struggles, American policymakers make a mistake not to press for decisions with a Soviet leader who, however ill, appears to be forthrightly empowered to act for the Politburo. Otherwise, the internal dynamics of Soviet decisionmaking may not allow decisive decisions of any nature, particularly for restraint, to be taken until a new leader emerges and consolidates authority.

Accordingly, at the risk of presumption, the advice I would give the administration is threefold:

(a) Give highest priority to articulating a more flexible position in the INF talks in Geneva, and be prepared to defer deployment of the Pershing II for 6 to 12 months if the Soviets signal a meaningful willingness to compromise. The United States has little choice except to reflect basic support for the NATO deployment decision. The increasingly dangerous action-reaction cycle of missile deployments must be broken. Neither security requirements nor NATO's desire not to appear indecisive can justify the acceleration of the arms race that a hasty deployment would entail.

(b) Amidst the concerns for an INF accord, do not forget the oldest arms control issue of them all, a comprehensive test ban. There is not an issue more in the national interest of both countries, nor one more capable of setting a new tone in East-West relations.

(c) Deescalate the confrontational rhetoric. While schoolboy wisdom teaches that words, unlike sticks and stones, do not hurt anybody, international politics they frequently lead to a hardening of positions and the ensconcing of national pride that makes accommodation irrationally difficult. It is time for American politicians to stop talking about windows of vulnerability and start emphasizing windows of opportunity.

In the three principal NATO countries—West Germany, Great Britain, and the United States—center/right parties have recently gained control of the executive. By narrow margins, the arguments for military preparedness have proven persuasive to the electorate. Today, the three principal center/right parties of the alliance—the CDU in Germany, the Conservatives in the United Kingdom, and the Republicans in the United States—have an opportunity to preempt for decades the opposition on foreign policy issues, but only if they prove capable of matching a willingness to sacrifice resources for preparedness with a capacity to demonstrate professional flexibility in arms control. It is time for Ronald Reagan to go to Leningrad.

Summitry has its disadvantages, but the world is ill-served by great power polemics and less by great power rivalries. World War I was begun with a terrorist act of destabilization in a small country. Far better it is to restrain the weaponry and reduce through negotiations the likelihood of confrontation in remote areas of the world. Détente is not a choice; in the nuclear age it is a necessity.●

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LEGACY ON ENDING THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a series of events this week forces many Americans to consider solemnly the most critical issue of our time: The real and growing threat of nuclear war.

Earlier this week, the House passed the biggest appropriations bill in the history of this Nation—a quarter of a trillion dollars for the most awesome assortment of weaponry ever conceived by mankind. Later this week, millions of Americans will watch a film, "The Day After," which chronicles the aftermath of a world in which those kinds of terrible weapons of destruction have been loosed on the United States.

On Wednesday, in the great rotunda of the Capitol, we conducted a memorial service to commemorate our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who was assassinated 20 years ago next Tuesday.

The world is very different today from the world President Kennedy knew. And the dangers of nuclear weapons, and the threats of nuclear annihilation—whether intentional or by accident—are more real today than they were in 1963.

When President Kennedy issued his warnings about the dangers of nuclear warfare, there were no MX missiles or B-1 bombers. There was no Pershing II, no neutron bomb, no SS-20. The nuclear weapons which frightened President Kennedy are only a fraction of the nuclear arsenal which exists today, an arsenal equivalent to 5,000 times the explosive power of all the munitions of all sides in World War II.

President Kennedy did not shy away from military spending, or even from military confrontation. Within his brief administration, we endured serious military crises at the Bay of Pigs, Berlin, Vietnam, and the Cuban blockade. While President Kennedy felt his failures deeply, he did not respond to his successes with strident bravado or confrontational arrogance.

Instead, President Kennedy's brushes with nuclear conflict made him recognize the need to pursue simultaneously a strong defense and efforts to reduce the likelihood of war. After having stared down our Soviet adversaries, he was willing to sit down with those same adversaries to seek ways of preventing military conflict.

"Let us never negotiate out of fear," he said in his inaugural address in 1961, "but let us never fear to negotiate."

Today, I fear, we have lost the inclination to negotiate for peace because our administration is flushed with the success of military victory. But thoughtful men and women, in this House and throughout the Nation, understand all too clearly that neither powerful weapons nor successful maneuvers diminish the need to reduce the nuclear threat through serious negotiations with the Soviet Union.

His words are more appropriate today than they were in 1963, because the threat of global nuclear war is greater today. During the last 20 years, there has been an enormous expansion in nuclear weaponry, and in the last several years, a disturbing deterioration in our relations with the Soviet Union.

President Kennedy acknowledged the need to expend "billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them." But he noted, "the acquisition of such idle stockpiles * * * is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace."

He challendged the notion that in a world as riddled with conflict as our own, it is fanciful to speak of controlling nuclear weapons.

"Some say it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament. But I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of universal peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics dream.

"Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions.

"Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable."

In an era when East-West tensions were as strained as today, Kennedy asserted that the people of both the United States and the Soviet Union yearned for a reduction in the threat of conflict between our two great nations.

"Both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race.

"So let us not be blind to our differences, but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity."

If President Kennedy's words made sense in the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs, the Cuban missile crisis, and the Berlin crisis, then they make sense in the wake of KAL 007 and Poland.

Yet today, I fear that on both sides, we are moving toward leaderships which gloat on their military successes rather than recognizing, as did John Kennedy, that each "success" is one further step toward the unthinkable, but not impossible, nuclear holocaust.

Do not misunderstand my words: the Soviet leaders are wary of our intentions, committed to ther political system, and confrontational in their style. Surely they regard us in precisely the same fashion. So if we are to move beyond this diplomatic gridlock, it will require a greater degree of trust and a greater commitment to peace than either side has exhibited in recent years.

And if assuring peace requires risks, what then are the risks of continuing a buildup in nuclear weapons and international confrontation which daily enhances the likelihood of nuclear accident, if not nuclear war? Is it not in the Soviet interest, as much as our own, to avert that tragedy?

"For in the final analysis," President Kennedy said, "our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet.

"We all breath the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal * * * All we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours of a nuclear exchange."

Those words took courage to utter in 1963, and they will require courage to act upon in 1983. But the stakes are the future of this planet and all the people of every country on it.

So as we recall President Kennedy, let us remember his most timely message: "We can seek a relaxation of tensions without relaxing our guard. And, for our part, we do not need to use threats to prove that we are resolute."

Surely we must be prepared to defend ourselves and our interests. But the world has grown too strong, our weapons too awesome, and the margin of error too minuscule to allow rhetoric and ideological rigidity to jeopardize our efforts to remove the nuclear threat.●

SUPPORT FOR STATE MINING AND MINERAL INSTITUTE PROGRAMS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 1983

● Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, State mining and mineral institutes across the country have proven to be very effective in training people for careers in mineral and mining industries and in improving our mineral research capabilities. However, we must continue to improve our mining techniques in order to remain competitive in the world marketplace. The mining and mineral industry is essential to the economic well-being and the security of our Nation. But without a strong mining and mineral resources research institute program, we will come to rely more on foreign mineral supplies and our domestic mining industry will suffer. According to Arpad E. Torma, professor of metallurgy and director of the State Mineral Resources Research Institute at New Mexico Tech, our lack of improved technology in the mining field has already become a serious problem. The United States is being forced to purchase an everincreasing amount of mining technology from other nations. We must put a stop to this dangerous trend.

I am an original cosponsor of legislation introduced by Congressman JAMES MCNULTY, H.R. 4214, to reauthorize and improve the State mining and mineral resources research institute program. This bill would authorize $7.5 million for fiscal year 1985, to be increased $1 million each year through fiscal year 1990. H.R. 4214 would also strengthen the eligibility requirements an institute must meet to qualify for assistance under the mineral institute program and it would increase the non-Federal matching requirements in order to force additional community and industry support.

One of the current problems with the mineral institute program is the lack of coordination between educational facilities, industry, and government. This legislation is designed to bring some order and direction to the program. First, H.R. 4214 would modify the existing advisory committee to include representativies from the industry and the academic community as well as the Federal Government. Second, the bill calls on the committee to develop a national plan for research and development in mining and mineral resources. The committee would also make recommendations on the implementation of this national plan.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident this legislation will revitalize the mining and mineral institute program and make certain that our mining industry is supplied with the best technology and the most talented employees possible. I urge members to support this important legislation.●

A JOINT RESOLUTION TO DESIGNATE 1984 AS THE "YEAR OF WATER"

HON. RAY KOGOVSEK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 1983

● Mr. KOGOVSEK. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues and I are today introducing a joint resolution to designate 1984 as the "Year of Water." As we are all aware, this very precious resource is possibly the most sought after commodity in the history of humankind, and will continue to hold this status. Although not a rare commodity, it is nonetheless, a fragile and precious resource, because without water, all life ceases to exist. Over the years, this country has developed unique systems of water management which have not only expanded the usable supply of annual yield, but also protected the users' interests and the quality of the resource.

Let me make it very clear, that I am not suggesting our water problems have been resolved to the extent that we can now sit back and watch the system in operation. At the very least, our work has just started. We are currently entering the critical times our predecessors forewarned would occur. Like it or not, we are facing a definite shortage of water in this Nation. Demands for available water supplies are increasing in the areas of agriculture, industries, and municipalities. Furthermore, as these demands increase, the availability of quality water supplies tends to decrease because of irrigation return flows in saline areas, effluent discharges, and municipal and industrial wastes returned to our rivers and streams.

I think you will agree that the subject of water—quality and quantity—is with us everyday of our lives. Yet, we must do more than simply recognize its existence, we must also recognize its importance. We must recognize what we have achieved in the area of water resource management, as well as closely examine the mistakes we have made in order to avoid making them again in the future. Most important, we must acknowledge that the quantity and quality of our water resources help to determine the progress we make in our daily lives.

In 1984, the U.S. Committee on Irrigation, Drainage and Flood Control will host the forthcoming 12th International Congress on Irrigation and Drainage in Fort Collins, Colo. The ICID will bring together water management professionals throughout the world to discuss new ideas and methodologies for controlling and putting our water resources to beneficial use. Therefore, we as a nation should join together in welcoming the International Congress on Irrigation and Drainage to this country, and demonstrate our strong commitment to heightened public awareness and concern for productive use of water resources. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join with me by enacting this most important joint resolution to designate 1984 as the "Year of Water."

H.J. RES. 424

Whereas water is a vital resource essential to all life; and

Whereas the quality, conservation and productive use of water are matters of immediate national and international concern; and

Whereas worldwide agriculture is the largest single user of water; and

Whereas the development of water management systems and technologies has contributed to America's leadership in agricultural production; and

Whereas in 1984 the United States will welcome the 12th International Congress on Irrigation and Drainage to Ft. Collins, Colorado, bringing together water management professionals from throughout the world; and

Whereas the United States Committee on Irrigation, Drainage and Flood Control will host the forthcoming 12th International Congress on Irrigation and Drainage, thereby continuing its distinguished tradition of national service begun in 1952; and

Whereas heightened public awareness and concern for the beneficial and productive use of water resources is deemed to be in the nation's interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the year 1984 is hereby designated as "The Year of Water" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to welcome the delegates from the 78 member nations of the International Congress on Irrigation and Drainage as they assemble for their 12th International Congress in Ft. Collins, Colorado, and to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and all interested groups and organizations to observe the Year of Water with increased awareness of, and dedication to, the interests of worldwide water resources and their immense importance to the welfare and well-being of humankind.●

ROUKEMA LAUDS MUSCARELLE FAMILY

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 1983

● Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this House for distinction the outstanding achievments and service to God and man of two of my fellow New Jerseyites, Joseph and Margaret Muscarelle.

Jesus taught us in Mark 10:14, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God."

In the spirit of this great Christian teaching, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention the efforts of two outstanding citizens, and two dear friends of mine, from the Fifth District of New Jersey. On Sunday, November 20, Mr. Muscarelle will be named "Man of the Year" and Mrs. Muscarelle will receive the "Humanitarian Award." They receive these awards from the Boys' Towns of Italy Committee of Bergen County.

Mr. Muscarelle knows firsthand the awful burden that fate can place on a person's shoulders. He was studying to join the medical profession at William and Mary College when he was forced to leave to support his family after a tragic accident placed that responsibility squarely on his shoulders. This would have left a lesser man despondent and broken as his life's dream escaped his grasp. He gained a new skill—carpentry. His continued hardwork and determination built not only survival for his family but eventually prosperity as he built a world-renown business from which the Muscarelle name has become the hallmark of excellence.

Yet he never forgot the avenues that education provided him even when his ambitions were interrupted. And he became determined to provide those avenues to others.

Over the years, Joseph and Margaret have selflessly provided to various educational, philanthropic, and professional organizations. The Joseph L. Muscarelle Foundation has since 1953 awarded 250 scholarships to college-bound students. Joseph had built, then endowed, the Joseph L. Muscarelle Center for Building Construction Studies at Fairleigh-Dickinson University in Hackensack, N.J.

In July 1983, Margaret established the Margaret Muscarelle Child Development Center in her hometown of Garfield. N.J. She is very active in child care programs at Hackensack Hospital, with the Italian Welfare League, and other organizations throughout the metropolitan New York area and across the United States.

Another shining example of the Muscarelles' "humanity to man" is their devotion to Boy's Towns of Italy. The Boys' Town began as schools for orphaned or deprived boys in Italy who has no other opportunity to attend regular schools. Through the care and concern they were given, these children had opportunities to develop into fine young men confident to face the future. Over the years, Boys' Towns have expanded and now included two Girls' Town.

Only the time limitations of the House prevent me from continuing the magnificent list of the fine accomplishments of these dear friends and fellow Italian Americans. I believe that it is a tribute that my colleagues honor Mr. and Mrs. Muscarelle today.●

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 1983

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in total, unequivocal support of the equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution. This amendment is needed as much now, if not more so, than when it was first sent out to the States for ratification in 1972. We here in the Congress took a bold and courageous step then, and I call on all of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to do the same today.

However, duty impels me to object to the manner and atmosphere in which this debate is being conducted today. First, I am upset by the shabby way in which the Democratic leadership of the House has chosen to deal with such an important piece of legislation. Pulling the measure out of the Rules Committee and then scheduling it at the last minute under the Suspension Calendar, removes the possibility of informed debate, which is the hallmark of the Democratic process. Riding roughshod over this piece of legislation is not the way to instill respect and support for this measure throughout the country.

Second, I want all Members to understand the reason why we have to vote again on the ERA. This is because the amendment fell three States short of ratification, and that the burden for failure of passage lies with the State legislators in those five States which could have provided women with the rights we so urgently need. In 1982, five States were targeted for ratification—Florida, Illinois, Missouri, North Carolina and Virginia. In each one of these States the legislature was controlled by the Democratic Party. Let me repeat—the failure of the ERA was due to the inaction and insensitivity of the Democrats in each of those five States. I was hesitant to bring this up, as I prefer to work in an atmosphere of bipartisanship, but the Democratic leadership has already clouded what should be a nonpartisan issue by making it appear to be a referendum on the GOP and its relationship with women in this country. I want to ask my Democratic colleagues in this room from those five States, where were you when the ERA was facing its most important test? I know where I was—down in Florida working to change the minds of State legislators. But where was the congressional leadership then—if they had wanted, they could have exerted the much needed pressure to pass this amendment in those various States.

Let us be fair, Mr. Speaker. I will grant you that the GOP has not been as strong on the national level for the ERA as it should be and I am working hard to change that. But at that crucial moment, when the ERA could have been passed by the States, this Nation was let down by a small group of Democrats in those five States. I mention this only to set the record straight.

Once again, I call on my fellow colleagues to do the right thing as this Congress did over a decade ago—pass the equal rights amendment. Thank you.●

INTERACTIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS

HON. VIN WEBER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great advances for education has been the use of interactive telecommunications. This prospect is especially important for my district which is largely rural. An effort is being made to link 18 counties into such a system. The great advantage is to use technology to bring education and educational services to a greater and diverse audience.

On Saturday, November 12, 1983, a public forum was held in my district at Southwest State University at Marshall, Minn., to explore the whole question of interactive telecommunications. This conference attracted sponsorship from Southwest State University, Southwest/West/Central Educational Cooperative Service Unit, Minnesota Tele-Media, the American Association of School Administrators, the Minnesota Association of School Administrators, and the Minnesota Federation of Teachers. It was a very interesting and productive session and I believe will be a major step toward bringing an interactive telecommunication system to my district.

The public forum was fortunate to have as its keynote speaker, Dr. Donald J. Senese, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Education Department. He provided some perceptive insights into the benefits of technology and how it will affect jobs in the future. I would like to enter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Assistant Secretary Senese's talk "Our Future Growth Is Tied to Educational Technology."

OUR FUTURE GROWTH IS TIED TO EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

(By Dr. Donald J. Senese)

Good Morning.

It is a pleasure to be here on the campus of Southwest State University on this cold, crisp and snowy morning. It is especially exciting to be part of a public forum here in Marshall, Minnesota on "Interactive Telecommunications."

I do want to acknowledge the leadership of Dr. Robert Carothers, President of Southwest State University, Glen Shaw, Executive Director of the Southwest/West Central Educational Cooperative Service Unit, and Penny Dickhudt of the staff of the Minnesota Tele-Media Board and others who worked so hard to put together this public forum today. It is also a pleasure to see the Governor's Office is represented by a member of the Governor's Science and Technology Staff, Ms. Cindy Crist.

Your hard work is especially evident by the sponsorship of this conference by Representative Vin Weber, Southwest/West Central Educational Cooperative Service Unit, Southwest State University and Minnesota Tele-Media as well as its endorsement by Senators Dave Durenberger and Rudy Boschwitz, the American Association of School Administrators, the Minnesota Association of School Administrators and the Minnesota Federation of Teachers.

Let me mention, you are indeed fortunate to have one of the brightest and hardest working congressman as your representative in Washington, D.C. Representative Vin Weber is one of those dynamic young representatives who has a great interest in education and he was one of the first members of Congress to hold hearings in his district to get reaction to the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Our acquaintanceship goes back to the days when we both worked on Capitol Hill and it is unfortunate that Congressional business kept him from being with us today. He has always been diligent to his duties as a U.S. Representative and he provides all of you with outstanding representation in our nation's capitol.

I am delighted to speak with you about a matter of vital concern to everyone—not just those of us present today but to everyone in our nation, indeed, the world. The matter to which I am referring is the advent of the new and exciting technologies which is not being referred to as the technological revolution.

The Random House College Dictionary defines a revolution as "a complete, pervasive, usually radical change in something, often one made relatively quickly."

And this does describe the situation as it pertains to the technological advances being made today. Changes are taking place and they are taking place rapidly. It is imperative that those who are associated with educating our youth prepare themselves to incorporate, in an appropriate manner, the new technologies into the educative process.

There are many aspects to this revolution and many dimensions to the way in which it will affect education as well as our society as a whole. One aspect which has caught the fancy of futurists, and one which should in fact be a vital concern of educators, is how the computer will affect the world of work—both in the near future as well as in the decades to come. Interactive communication will be playing a greater role in urban as well as rural areas.

There are many questions raised by this particular issue. For example:

How can the computer enhance a workers ability to perform various tasks? How can it improve upon existing jobs?

How and will it affect the existence of many jobs?

Will the workday pattern of 9 to 5 at an office still exist or will going to an office become passe as a network of cottage industries with everyone working out of his or her own home, communicating with colleagues and clients by machine?

I, of course, cannot give you a definitive answer to any of these questions but I can share with you some of the developments and information which can offer a perspective on the subject.

The advent of high technology has already begun to affect the job market. It has been pointed out that one of the reasons that its impact is so dramatic as far as the workplace is concerned is that it affects a large number of occupations at once. Many times the development of a new technology might affect only one or a few related job areas. Today's high technology is affecting or will eventually affect almost every job area.

An analogy might be the advent of the automobile. Not everyone needs to be an automobile mechanic or know how to design automobiles but it is the rare individual in today's society who does not know how to drive an automobile. The invention of the automobile opened many areas of work. These included bridge engineers, design and manufacture of automobiles, design and repair of roadways, those connected with new industries such as fast food and motor inns, as well as many other jobs peripherally related to the auto. It also changed dramatically patterns of work by improving the speed of transport. People were now able to get to an office some distance from their home and to return in the same day.

So, while we don't all have jobs that are directly related to the automobile, it is more than likely that what we do is at least indirectly affected by the invention of what was less than a century ago an unheard of means of transportation.

Experts differ on how much the new technologies will affect the job market—some even say very little—but educators would be remiss to ignore this growing area.

In the area of high technology employment, predictions from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show high levels of growth during the 1980s for data processing mechanics, computer operators, and computer analysts with their respective levels of growth in employment being 92.3%, 71.6%, and 67.8%.

Not all jobs directly involving high technology necessarily involve a college education but almost all involve specialized training, and most likely, at some point, re-training.

And, additional training will become necessary for some occupations. For example, Gene Maeroff points out in the September 4 issue of the New York Times that: "The use of computers may make them matter more as health technicians, for example, use more sophisticated diagnostic tools that have more complex instructions and yield more detailed data. For most young people then, movement up the career ladder will mean taking continuing education programs."

The new technologies can vastly improve a workers ability to perform a job. For example, take the job of a farmer operating a farm. The farmer to many people would seem far removed from the world of high-tech. And yet, he is not. The computer can provide many time-saving services for the farmer. It can assist him in recordkeeping. It can provide information which will tell him the optimum time of the year for planting each crop and in doing so it can take into account variables such as weather conditions which could ultimately improve the harvest or even save a crop. Computers can talk to other computers so that an isolated farmer could be provided with a valuable means of communication.

Along those lines, and with far-reaching significance for not only the farmer but for almost everyone, is the introduction by a commercial firm of the Electronic University. An educational telecommunications system that requires no computer experience to use, it connects personal computers of students with personal computers of teachers. It can be used by anyone, anywhere in the world, to communicate with another person anywhere in the world. It has no geographical barriers. The technology which has made this possible is significant because it has eliminated the barrier of getting two computers together for communication.

The student and instructor will be able to communicate back and forth, in person, on the computer. Messages can be left through electronic mail.

It removes tremendous barriers to education. A handicapped person can learn or teach from his or her own home. People in remote areas will be able to take or offer classes.

The announcement launching the Computer University took place on September 12 of this year. Initially, 170 courses are being offered with many more in the developmental stage.

U.S. Secretary of Education, Terrel Bell, praised the electronic university for its potential to reach "all learners on all levels." This concept can open the doors of learning to virtually everyone.

It is also an exciting prospect as a means of retraining workers. Training for a career, until now, usually lasted a lifetime. It is likely that a person starting a career today may need as many as 3 or 4 re-trainings during their productive years.

The displaced worker is becoming a problem and could perhaps become an even greater problem in the future. It is a problem for which President Reagan has shown great concern. The Job Training Partnership Act, which began full operation on October 1, is an example of the type of program that could be of assistance in dealing with the problem of those who need additional job training or job re-training.

We can not say precisely at this time how the job market is going to change but we know that it will be changing. The Job Training Partnership Act is one of the types of steps that can be taken to deal with the problem of displaced workers that such changes are likely to bring about. This Act should be helpful to those who are facing troubles brought about by a changing job market.

The Job Training Partnership Act focuses on assisting people to obtain the skills needed in order to obtain a job. The emphasis is on helping them to get a job so that they can be less dependent on the government.

If large numbers of people are going to need job training or re-training to obtain a job it could create great demands and strain on government, if, instead of obtaining these skills, these individuals become dependent on the government for support. It is a problem that concerns all levels of government—federal, state, and local—and the new law is designed to encourage all levels of government to work with the private sector on a problem that concerns them all.

Following the philosophy of President Reagan the program uses a block grant approach. Most of the control of the program is in the hands of local rather than federal officials.

Money allocated for the JTPA is money which is to be spent for training, unlike its predecessor, CETA, which emphasized paying wages rather than training for employment. There is no public sector job funding under the Act which stresses instead partnership with the private sector.

The programs for training participants will last from six to twleve months depending on the area of training for the participant. There will be an emphasis on skills training in high technology areas as well as other critical areas. Business and industry are full-partners in the program which cuts down on government cost.

Because of the block grant approach implementation will vary according to the approach of the local decision-makers.

The new technologies are important to educators. They will affect not only what we teach but how we teach it. More and more educators are beginning to recognize the great potential of technology to enhance learning of students, increase teacher productivity, and produce more effective schools.

The recently released report by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, has done much to focus national attention on education.

The Commission was appointed by U.S. Secretary of Education, Terrel H. Bell. The job of the Commission was to review and report on the status of education throughout the United States.

The report which resulted has alarmed many educators. It presented documented evidence that shows many aspects of our educational system to be in serious trouble. We cannot afford to be complacent about our schools; we cannot accept the status quo.

Allow me to quote from the report: "Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world . . . the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur—others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments. . . We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament.

The findings of the Commission were hardly a surprise to educators who have perceived these trends over the past few years. The same alarming trends were confirmed by other reports which were issued subsequently: The Action for Excellence report of the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth by the Education Commission of the States, the Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy, and America's Competitive Challenge: The Need for a National Response, of the Business-Higher Education Forum.

These reports issue a clarion call to all of us to assess where we have been in education where we are presently, and where we should be going. It is important to realize that money alone will not resolve our problems in education. We are already spending a total of $230 billion per year on education—public and private. An excessive infusion of money could result in more problems if it is used to make the same mistakes but with more resources.

Obviously, some things are right with American education and some things need improving. The report by the National Commission on Excellence in Education provides an impetus for not only those who have careers in education but the public at large to focus on improving education.

There has been a lot of interest generated by the report and the recommendations of the Commission. If it has done nothing else, it has created a renewed interest in education and brought it to the forefront of issues facing us today.

This is very positive for education. Given time, I believe the interest will generate some very beneficial results in the education of our young people.

One recommendation of the Commission which is pertinent to our discussion here today is related to State and local high school graduation requirements. The Commission is calling for the strengthening of these requirements and states: "at a minimum, all students seeking a diploma be required to lay the foundations in the Five New Basics by taking the following curriculum during their 4 years of high school: (a) 4 years of English; (b) 3 years of mathematics; (c) 3 years of science; (d) 3 years of social studies; and (e) one-half year of computer science. For the college-bound, 2 years of foreign language in high school are strongly recommended in addition to those taken earlier."

I believe it is especially significant that a recommendation is made for computer science. Computers are beginning to have a vital role in the educational arena; it is inevitable that that role will continue to grow at an ever increasing rate. It is significant to note that the Commission feels that it is already important enough for every student receiving a high school diploma to have at least one half year of computer science. Even those of us who have championed the liberal arts recognize that there is such a thing as a "new liberal arts". The concept of a liberal education has focused on education as serving the inner being of the individual and the spirit of society rather than just material needs; it caters to the human urge to understand the world in which the individual finds himself rather than give in to an animal need to exert some control over the world. Stephen White, Director of Special Projects for the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, notes that the computer is beginning to do for the mind of man what the engine did for the muscle of man: "The engine permitted man to manipulate matter in great bulk and at great speed; the computer permits man to manipulate data with the same extraordinary facility."

Thus the "new liberal arts" require a knowledge of "technology" and "analytical skills". For the teacher in any field, as well as the poet, the artist and the philosopher, live in a world in which they must deal with data during the dawning of an "information society". And such innovative institutions as Carnegie-Mellon University expect that almost every one of their students by 1986 will be working on a computer not just in math and engineering but in drama, music, history and writing. We all know that the technology revolution is not the future; it is here now.

Instructional technology offers us a great opportunity to improve education. We must not treat it as a fad or game but as a tool tied to quality and excellence in education.

During a National Teleconference on Educational Technology held on June 22, 1982, in Washington, D.C., Secretary Bell announced that technology would be one of his lead initiatives in education. There were over forty-five State sites, including the one in D.C., that participated in two days of activities highlighting technology in education.

The Office of Educational Research and Improvement was selected by the Secretary to take the lead in implementing his initiative on technology. OERI has become involved with a number of interesting and exciting educational programs.

Our Center for Libraries and Educational Improvement is monitoring several contracts which utilize technology to improve the teaching of the basic skills. One of these is a communication program known as Project Quill. It uses a set of microcomputer-based programs around which several instructional activities have been developed. The activities are geared to young writers in grades 3 to 6. Quill utilizes the microcomputer's technological capabilities to help teachers teach writing. The youngster's natural enthusiasm for anything connected with the computer strongly motivates them to write and to perform the various tasks which are a part of the program. It has helped to eliminate the drudgery of rewriting compositions by hand. Corrections and rewrites can be made quickly on the word processor and a print-out secured. In addition we are also supporting studies focusing on the use of computers to teach math and science.

We are also using technology, educational television, to teach science through such programs as the "Voyage of the Mimi" and, in cooperation with the National Science Foundation, "3-2-1 Contact".

Our National Center for Education Statistics has completed surveys showing the growing use of computers in the schools.

The National Diffusion Network, also under OERI, identifies exemplary programs and assists schools to implement them. Under Secretary Bell's leadership, the NDN initiated "Lighthouse Projects". As a result of the current emphasis on technology, the National Diffusion Network has awarded grants to ten "Lighthouse Projects" in Technology. The Lighthouse Projects are designated as such because they are using technology to enhance education in an outstanding way. The federal grants will enable those schools to host visitors from all over the country and to provide material on their adaptations of technology to school use.

The programs are:

Project C.O.F.F.E.E. or the Cooperative Federation for Educational Experiences located in Oxford, Massachusetts. It offers a regional alternative occupational education program in high technology to secondary school age youth, some of whom were previously school dropouts. C.O.F.F.E.E. is noteworthy for the exemplary school/business partnership which it has formed with the Digital Equipment Corporation of Bedford, Massachusetts and for which it received a Presidential Commendation. Digital has been extremely supportive of school efforts to learn about and use computers.

The Merrimack Education Center in Chelmsford, Massachusetts. It is a computer assisted instruction program developed to assist in the improvement of basic skills instruction for compensatory education populations. The program staff includes professional educators who are available to provide technical assistance in introducing successful computer applications to the schools. The Project consists of four main components: (1) Computer Assisted Instruction, (2) School System Computer Support, (3) Computer Training and (4) Computer Software Exchange Library.

In Asbury Park, New Jersey, the Board of Education offers a course which utilizes computer assisted instruction for secondary mathematics courses in grades 9-12. Educational software designed for the purpose of integrating computer-assisted instruction with traditional techniques utilized in teaching Algebra I, Alegra II, Geometry, Trigonometry, Calculus, and Applied Mathematics has been developed and field tested for purposes of the program.

The Evaluation Center, located here in Minnesota in the Hopkins Public Schools, Hopkins, Minnesota is involved in the implementation and utilization of data processing systems in the administrative, management, and instructional functions of schools. Most recently, it is concentrating on the utilization of microcomputers.

Project READ:S or the Reading Education Accountability Design: Secondary (Idaho) is a comprehensive secondary level reading program (grades 7 to 12) with a computer assisted component. It utilizes motivations and technological advantages of the microcomputer in the direct instruction, reinforcement, inservice training of teachers, and the management processes which are integral to the reading program itself.

Project CUE or Computer Utilization in Education (New York) is a criterion-referenced reading and mathematics curriculum offered in a laboratory setting which utilizes computer assisted instructional applications as the primary instructional methodology by which remedial services are provided.

MATH/TECH (California) is a mathematics project which systematically integrates the microcomputer into the 7th-12th grade classroom utilizing an easy-to-use curriculum which supplements and parallels the traditional 7th-12th grade mathematics curriculum.

RECIPE or Research Exchange for Computerized Individualized Program for Education (Florida) is a program for learning disabled children in grades K-6. It is an objective based instructional and computer management system that assists these students in mastering specific objectives in the basic skills areas of reading, mathematics, and writing.

Project CAISH or Computer Assisted Instruction and Support for the Handicapped (Arkansas) is targeted at ninth grade students. It is an approach which attempts to provide a basic level of literacy and competency in computer science through hands-on experience, as well as providing students who have the aptitude and interest the opportunity to develop higher level skills in computer science and programming.

Project HOSTS, Helping One Student to Succeed, of Vancouver, Washington, which covers computer-assisted instruction and literacy programs (electronics, physics, chemistry, math, music, word processing, gifted program, summer computer camps, and telecommunications).

In order to better focus on the potential of the computer, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in November of 1982 convened a Research Conference in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The conference participants were asked to examine the future of computers in education as well as examining what research is needed in order to realize the potential of the computer.

A number of education related occupations were represented among the forty experts invited to participate. These included: scientists, psychologists, educational researchers, teachers, and school administrators. A two volume work entitled "Computers in Education: Realizing the Potential" resulted from that conference. In the Chairmen's report, computers are acknowledged as "tools of education"—for both students and teachers. The report states:

"Computers can be powerful intellectual tools. They can perform arithmetic calculations and are becoming able to manipulate equations; they can facilitate the writing process and expedite formatting and revision; they can retrieve information from large data bases. These capabilities can be used to shift educational emphasis from the teaching of routine skills to the teaching of the more sophisticated thinking skills needed in our technological society. They can also be used to improve learning in nontechnology areas."

There has been growing concern recently throughout the nation, about the poor showing of students in the basics. Standardized scores verify that colleges and employers concerns regarding students poor performance in reading, writing, mathematics, and science is indeed a fact. Performance in these areas has been on the decline for the past two decades. With proper application there is no reason why computers can not serve as a tool to improve teaching and learning in these very important areas. Interest is being focused on the Hempstead model. The Hempstead School district in New York state, serving largely a disadvantaged student group, has demonstrated that microcomputer aided preparation can be an effective and relatively inexpensive way of helping students raise their SAT scores.

We have an obligation to educate American students to the best of their academic ability. President Reagan has noted that while the role of the federal government is limited in the area of education, nevertheless, there is much the federal government can do to "help set a national agenda for excellence in education, a commitment to quality that can open new opportunities and new horizons for young people."

We must educate a generation of Americans with the understanding and skills to fully participate in the technological world in which they must function.

We Americans have a bright and optimistic future, and we cheat our youth if we paint a picture of the future which is grim and despairing.

We have had too much emphasis on the negatives—energy resources drying up, pollution of the environment, and burdens of the "have not" nations supposedly imposed by the "have" nations. Dr. Herman Kahn, who died suddenly earlier this year, noted that even more significant that what our children are being taught is what they are not being taught. The lessons unlearned in our classrooms are that the wealthy nations play a constructive and essential role in furthering world economics, that rapid economic growth has changed many non-Western nations from poor to middle-income status, and that most resources are more accessible and less costly today than ever before. In addition, he noted that all these forms of progress are likely to proceed even more effectively in the future.

In his last great work, The Coming Boom, Dr. Kahn reminded us that high technology promises to bring back "a sense of excitement, achievement, and progress which even astronauts and outer space no longer elicit."

I commend you in Minnesota for the excellent work you are doing. As you can see, many exciting programs are already in place. These are exciting times for educators. This 18 county interactive telecommunications is such a program. As pioneers for education we are in a position to open new frontiers as we chart a course for the future. We can, and I am sure will, improve and adapt education in America to meet the needs of today's student, tomorrow's citizen.●

WELCOME HOME, NICKY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday was a joyous occasion for many people in my Fifth Congressional District, for it was the day that Nicky Goode came home from the hospital, looking, at last, a bit more like the 2-year-old that he is. For Nicky Goode is one of the most recent recipients of a liver transplant, and I am very happy to report he is doing very well.

This happy homecoming, surrounded by his family and friends, opens a new chapter in Nicky Goode's life. Since birth, he has suffered from a rare birth defect that prevented the excretion of bile from his liver. Without the transplant, he may not have lived beyond his third year of life.

Today he is learning to walk and is gaining weight. His skin is a color more characteristic of young children rather than the greenish color of before. He enjoys being around people, and proudly wears his t-shirt emblazoned with the words, "I love my new liver." Says his mother, Ginger, "He's the baby I really always wanted."

But Nicky is not out of the woods yet. His mother and father, Ginger and Michael Goode, must continue to monitor his health. Daily he must take two doses of needed anti-rejection medication, and he goes on weekly doctor visits.

Because of the concern of the community, the Goodes can rest a bit easier. They are surrounded by friends, neighbors, and people who may not know the Goodes directly, but are moved by Nicky's plight—all who offer support and help.

Since the Goodes first learned about the possible operation, people have come to their aid. The Morningside Volunteer Fire Department held auctions, fundraisers, and bake sales on their behalf, and raised more than $135,000 for hospital bills and expenses incurred by the family. The chief at Morningside, Les Hedrick, and the many others who devoted hundreds of hours of their time on behalf of the Goodes are to be commended.

One of the first to greet Nicky on his return home was Danny Butler, 19, of Laurel. He was one of the first children in the United States to receive a liver transplant. While that day, Thanksgiving in 1974, may seem far away to most of us, to Danny it too marked a new beginning. We are so happy he is with us today to share in the joy of the Goode family and to provide the kind of moral support they so vitally need during this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my sincere good wishes and those of my colleagues here in the House to the Goode family and our greatest hopes for Nicky for a happy and productive life.●

KIND WORDS FROM ITALY

HON. JOHN HILER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. HILER. Mr. Speaker, I was very honored recently to have provided a U.S. flag which was flown over the Capitol building as a gift to the Imperial Naval Museum of Italy. This was presented at the request of Mr. Frank Rizzo of Elkhart, Ind., on behalf of the 39th World Congress of the A.I.C.H., or International Association of Cape Horners.

The A.I.C.H. is a reknown organization of individuals from all over the world who hold a master mariner's license and have sailed around Cape Horn. Mr. Rizzo, a highly-respected businessman from northern Indiana, is himself a native of Genoa, Italy, and retired captain in the U.S. Navy. His active participation in the A.I.C.H. has succeeded in spreading American good will throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Rizzo and extending our appreciation to Claudio Scajola, who responded in behalf of the Imperial Naval Museum and Communal Administration of the Government of Italy. I submit the letter from Mr. Scajola and commend it to my colleagues. I deeply appreciate the translation of the letter, which was provided by Mr. Anthony Panzica of South Bend, Ind., who like Mr. Rizzo, is a highly respected Hoosier businessman of Italian heritage.

May 26, 1983.

Honorable Sir: In the name of the Communal Administration and myself, we thank you for your sensitivity and your interest on behalf of the United States of America, on your gift to the Imperial Naval Museum of the flag of the U.S.A., on the occasion of the 39th World Congress of the A.I.C.H., the International Association of Cape Horners.

The gift comments (rivets) the sincere friendly sentiments operating between Italy and the United States of America.

Please convey to your government my thanks plus our message of sincere congeniality from my colleagues of the Congress.

Our accolade, Honorable Sir, is a medal recording our city together with my friendly and cordial salute.

Claudio Scajola.●

THE HANDICAPPED INDEPENDENCE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1983

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today companion legislation to Senator Matsunaga's S. 1115, the Handicapped Independence Assistance Act of 1983. Congressmen Heftel, Matsui, and Zschau are cosponsors of this legislation, which treats certain sensory and communication aids as medical and health services, reimbursable under medicare and medicaid.

Sensory and communication aids increase the communication capabilities of those with sensory impairments—hearing, speech, and sight. Advanced technologies have enabled sensory aids produced to develop increasingly effective tools for the disabled. For instance, Phonic Ear developed an FM radio transmission system for use in educating the hearing impaired in the 1970's. Other devices include a speech synthesizer specifically developed for use by non-oral individuals.

Unfortunately, most handicapped people have already used their insurance money and private resources on basic medical needs, and cannot afford any further expenses. Third-party insurers, including medicare and medicaid, generally do not deem sensory aids as medically necessary and reimbursable as durable medical equipment. However, other nations do. For instance, Scandinavian nations consider sensory aids medically necessary. In addition, Italy began a few years ago paying for personal sensory aids for children when the child could be integrated and mainstreamed into regular classrooms. Other European nations provide similar support.

Some raise questions about the cost of this proposal. I am also concerned about increased demands on our already burdened medicare and medicaid systems. However, increasing the communication capabilities of the sensory disabled will give them greater employment and educational opportunities. Greater independence and potential for productive employment among the handicapped will reduce welfare and disability payments, reduce the number of hours necessary for attendant care and special school services, and increase Federal, State, and local tax revenues.

The Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago estimates that one electronic communication aid provided to one child at school for 8 hours a day pays for itself in 148 days. Preliminary cost analysis figures provided by Bob Humphreys, former Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, demonstrate that by the third year of medicare coverage of sensory aids, benefits could reach $31 million from reduced social welfare payments and increased tax revenues. During committee consideration of the bill, we hope to develop definite cost-and-benefit projections.

With medicare and medicaid recognizing the need for and benefits of sensory aids coverage, other third-party insurers will begin providing coverage. Sensory aids companies will find an increased market for their devices, and greater returns from their capital investments. More resources will be invested in research and development, further increasing technological developments to replace lost sensory abilities.

In addition to the fiscal benefits of having a more employable and independent handicapped population, the personal rewards implied are promising. A child with a severe speech impairment would communicate more easily and readily with his friends and teachers, bridging the gap between what he knows and what he can express. A severely physically disabled adult unable to use his head or arms for functional tasks, entirely dependent on another to control his environment, may use an environmental control unit to operate electrical devices, an emergency call system and a telephone. This legislation answers basic human needs for the sensory impaired. It also strives to meet the test of progress, according to Franklin D. Roosevelt:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

In September 1982, the Science and Technology Committee, on which I serve, received a report from the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), where I serve on the Board. OTA's report, "Technology and Handicapped People," concluded that the most important issues to be addressed relate to financing, distributive justice, and coordinating programs and goals. This report clearly indicates the need for Government support of developing technologies to aid the handicapped. I believe this legislation would answer some of the questions raised in the OTA report.

Bob Humphreys spoke before the executive committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in May of this year. In his words:

We spend many billions of dollars on disability payments which foster and entrench dependence, while inadequately supporting independence-generating rehabilitation, special education, independent living, and other community based services.

This legislation strives to generate independence and rehabilitation. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this and similar legislation to improve the Federal Government's role in helping the disabled acquire employment and achieve independence.

The text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Handicapped Independence Assistance Act of 1983".

SECTION 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the increased availability and use of technologically advanced sensory and communication aids, equipment, and devices by individuals who are blind, severely visually impaired, deaf, severely hearing impaired, or vocally impaired would reduce the handicaps of such individuals with respect to employment, education, and self-care;

(2) such sensory and communication aids, equipment, and devices would open many new job opportunities for their users, but are beyond the financial means of many such individuals;

(3) although payment for such aids, equipment and devices is not expressly prohibited by statutes authorizing Federal health insurance programs, regulations of both Federal and State agencies result in widespread denials of such payments; and

(4) Wider acquisition of such aids, equipment, and devices by persons with disabilities would benefit the national economy, disabled persons, and their families through increased employment, independence, and improved education for such persons, and is therefore in the national interest.

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

SEC. 3. (a)(1) Section 1861(s) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (11) through (14) as paragraphs (12) through (15) respectively;

(B) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (9);

(C) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraph:

"(11) sensory and communication aids designed to substantially reduce or eliminate handicaps to employment and education caused by blindness, deafness, a severe hearing or visual impairment, or the inability to communicate vocally, including training in the use of such aids.".

(2) Section 1864(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraphs (11) and (12)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (12) and (13)".

(b) Section 1862(a)(1) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking out the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof ", and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(D) in the case of items and services described in section 1861(s)(11), which are not reasonable and necessary for reducing or eliminating handicaps caused by blindness, deafness, a severe hearing or visual impairment, or the inability to communicate vocally;".

(c) Section 1833 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) With respect to expenses incurred for items and services described in section 1861(s)(11), no more than $5,000 in any calendar year, and no more than $15,000 in any five consecutive calendar years, shall be considered as incurred expenses for purposes of subsections (a) and (b).".

(d) Section 1905(a)(12) of such Act is amended by inserting after "devices" the following: ", including sensory and communication aids described in section 1861(s)(11)".

(e) The amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to items and services furnished on or after January 1, 1985.●

THE DEFICIT IS NOT OUR ONLY ECONOMIC PROBLEM

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I wrote a series of columns commenting on the Reagan tax package of 1981. Utilizing Senator HOWARD BAKER's description of the President's supply-side polices as a "riverboat gamble," I expressed the opinion that the administration's economic forecasts were at best questionable and at worst potentially disastrous.

Of particular concern to me at the time was the assertion that reduced taxes would generate enough corporate and household savings to finance a growing deficit. I also questioned the notion that a tax cut would stimulate corporate fixed investment. We now face unprecedented Federal deficits which, combined with our plummeting savings rate, threaten our long-term economic solvency. Put simply, Mr. Speaker, we a Nation are borrowing and consuming at such a pace that we risk aborting the economic recovery, and virtually insure that we will not have the financial resources to retool for operating in an increasingly competitive international market.

MIT economist Lester Thurow says it this way:

To be competitive on international markets and to break out of the stagnation in our standard of living, Americans needed the latest equipment and technology. But that requires investment and if someone is to invest, someone else must save to provide the necessary funds.

But Americans are not saving. The level of savings has, in fact, taken a nosedive in 1983 after a decline that began when the first tax cut was enacted. In 1981 the savings rate as a percentage of disposable income was 6.6 percent annually. Last year the rate fee to 5.8 percent, and the second quarter of this year showed only a 4.4-percent rate. The 4.4-percent rate was the lowest in 33 years.

Thurow, who expresses the savings rate as a percentage of GNP—under this interpretation, personal savings accounted for only 3.3 percent of GNP for the first 9 months of 1983—notes that our deficit, now 5.7 percent of GNP, represents "negative savings." When you combine the "negative savings," or loss, in the Federal budget with the low personal savings rate, you find that we are not only eating up all of the country's personal savings but taking a large proportion of business savings as well.

What can we do to cure this problem? The intellectually simple answer seems to be to manage the deficit, either through reduced spending or higher taxes. Managing the deficit is essential, because until the deficit is reduced I fear that the Nation's markets will anticipate credit shortages, thus keeping interest rates high.

But even after we reduce the deficit, the problem of a low savings rate remains. Over the long term, reduced savings are going to reduce investment opportunities, or make investment prohibitively costly. In addition to managing our deficit problems, we must plan for economic growth. We must learn to save now rather than mortgaging our economic future.

Americans have been consumers for the last four decades, and that pattern of consumption has brought us great wealth. But it is a transient kind of wealth—a material surplus that we will not be able to replace as our factories grind down to the useless ash of aged and technologically surpassed ruin.

In the United States, consumption is promoted; savings and investment is not. As Thurow points out "we have built a society where it is possible to get almost anything without having to save." Easy credit, low down payments, and the tax deductibility of interest make us the ultimate in the modern consumption-oriented society. In 1982, for example, 66 percent of gross personal savings went directly back into the market as loans for the purchase of consumption goods. The remainder represents that very low figure from which we draw funds to pay for the Federal deficit and finance investment.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress needs to act not only to address the deficit problem, but to encourage savings, for that is where we can guarantee our economic future. Tax cuts alone will not encourage savings—the Reagan plan has demonstrated that. Perhaps restricting incentives to consume would be more effective in making us a Nation of savers.

For the interest of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this time a recent article by Lester Thurow in the November 21 issue of Newsweek that makes that point very well.

WHERE CREDIT IS NOT DUE

(By Lester C. Thurow)

In the 1980 election campaign President Reagan rightly charged that Americans saved too little. To be competitive on international markets and to break out of the stagnation in our standard of living, Americans needed the latest equipment and technology. But that required investment and if someone is to invest, someone else must save to provide the necessary funds.

Under President Carter, personal savings was 4.1 percent of the GNP. But during those same four years the federal deficit amounted to 1.7 percent of the GNP. Since deficits represent funds borrowed from private savings but used to finance public consumption, any deficit represents negative savings. If the negative savings of the federal government are added to personal savings, only 2.4 percent of the GNP was being saved under President Carter. This was, and is, inadequate.

What has happened since then?

BIAS

In 1981 President Reagan proposed and enacted a personal-income-tax cut biased toward high-income groups on the ground that such a bias would provide more disposable income to those able and willing to save. But the strategy did not work. With the tax cut fully in place in 1983, personal savings was down to 3.3 percent of the GNP in the first nine months of the year.

The large tax cuts in conjunction with the big buildup in defense also raised the federal deficit to 5.7 percent of the GNP. As a result the net federal- plus personal-savings rate was actually negative—minus 2.4 percent the GNP. Not only was the federal government diverting all of personal savings to public consumption, it was diverting a large fraction of business savings as well.

No country can compete and grow with a federal-plus personal-savings rate of minus 2.4 percent. That is simply a route to long-run economic failure.

If you look at personal-savings rates abroad (both West Germany's and Japan's are nearly three times higher), there is a simple explanation: less consumer credit.

For there are only three reasons why anyone saves—you are a miser, you want to die rich or you want to buy something that you cannot afford without saving. While there are a few misers and a few whose only goal is to die rich, most saving occurs because people want to buy something that they cannot afford out of current income. But if it is possible to get what you want without saving, that is precisely what most people will do. And it is here that Americans have been geniuses. For we have built a society where it is possible to get almost anything without having to save.

But when I borrow $30,000 to buy the recreational vehicle that I want, not only don't I save, I subtract $30,000 from the pool of savings available for industrial investment. Someone else's $30,000 savings must be used to finance my consumption purchase.

What is officially measured as personal savings is not the gross amount individuals save, but net savings—personal savings minus personal borrowings to buy consumption goods. And the difference between low American savings rates and high German or Japanese savings rates is not so much in the differences in our gross personal-savings rates but in the amounts that we borrow back for consumption purposes. In 1982 consumption lending absorbed 66 percent of our gross personal savings.

ECONOMIC CARROT

The rest of the industrial world is simply much more restrictive when it comes to consumer credit—demanded down payments are larger, repayment must be faster, interest charges are not tax-deductible. Our industrial competitors simply don't allow consumer credit to eat up 66 percent of their gross personal savings. And if we are to raise America's savings rates we will have to do likewise.

When it comes to high personal-savings rates the key is not the economic carrot of lower taxes (people will simply consume their higher disposable incomes) but the economic stick of less consumer credit. If you cannot get what you want without saving, you will save. It's that simple.

Reducing the negative savings implicit in the federal deficit is as technically easy, and as politically unattractive, as raising the personal-savings rate. It will require a large tax increase. for whatever you believe about expenditure reductions, no one, and certainly not President Reagan, can devise $200 billion in expenditure reductions.

Thus, if we are serious about the need for more savings, we will have to start talking seriously about less consumer credit and more consumer taxes.●

TEMPORARIES FOOD FOR CHRISTMAS FOUNDATION

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the efforts of the Temporaries Food for Christmas Foundation, a nonprofit foundation whose sole aim is to help the elderly and needy families during the Christmas holiday season and all year long.

Temporaries, Inc. is a national temporary help service with 29 offices in 21 major marketplaces throughout the United States. Founded in Washington, D.C. in 1969, Temporaries, Inc. and the people behind it believe that businesses should return resources and energy to the community in which they operate. This belief led to the founding of the Temporaries Food for Christmas Foundation. Since its inception in 1974, the foundation has raised hundreds of thousands of canned food items through its food drives. The foundation has grown to serve the Nation, as it is funded and supported through every office in every city of Temporaries, Inc.

The foundation's ninth annual Food for Christmas Drive will be held December 6 to 11 in the Metropolitan Washington area. Gifts of canned food go directly to the recipients of the program and other community service groups such as the Senior Citizens Counseling and Delivery Service, HELP/FISH Volunteer Groups of Maryland, and United Communities Ministries, Inc. The Food Drive is important to the happiness and well-being of many people this Christmas season, and I am hopeful that this year's drive is the most successful to date.

The Food for Christmas Foundation is supported by various fundraisers and businesses in the Maryland-Washington area. Their annual Food for Christmas Ball, to be held this year on December 2, is a major vehicle for charitable donations to this worthy cause. The ball draws many corporate sponsors and patrons from a wide variety of business fields—major sports teams such as the Washington Capitals and Bullets, radio stations such as WKYS-FM and WRC-AM, TV stations, such as WRC and WJLA, restaurants, and more. I recognize and commend the philanthropic efforts of all the supporters of this noble and needed foundation.

As the holiday season draws nearer, and we each begin to count our blessings for the many rewards that have been bestowed upon us, we must also take care to remember that we are not the rule but the exception to it. It is sad that there is even a need for organizations such as the Temporaries Food for Christmas Foundation, yet in a never-perfect world such as our own we are grateful that such organizations do exist.

In a time of year when we celebrate and honor man's decency, compassion, and capacity for joy and love, the altruistic efforts of all the honest, caring people associated with the Temporaries Food for Christmas Foundation serve as shining examples of the holiday spirit and man's humanity to man.●

THE SOVIETS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the dark and cruel record of the Soviet Government in the treatment of its citizens. The true dimensions of the Soviet human rights tragedy is, however, made tangible and very personal when we become involved in efforts to assist individuals and families who are being oppressed and hurt by that Government.

For a number of months, I have been trying to help reunite a young woman, Sandra Gubin, with her husband, Aleksei, who lives in Kiev. There is nothing political or complex about the case. It is as simple as two young married people wanting to spend their lives together. The Chicago Sun-Times printed an excellent article about this couple. I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD and I hope Members will take a moment to read it.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 25, 1983]

PAIR HOPES FOR REUNION DESPITE U.S.-SOVIET CHILL

ANN ARBOR, MICH.—Aleksei Pavlovich Lodisev, Russian husband of American Sandra Gubin, went from his home in Kiev to Moscow this week to plead for compassion at a particularly angry time in American-Soviet relations.

His goal was the same as the reason for the five letters Gubin writes to Soviet President Yuri V. Andropov in Moscow every week—the husband and wife want to be reunited.

"All I want is to have Aleksei here with me and to begin having children," or a paraphrase of that thought is in every one of those letters she has written since May 23.

Included in the blizzard of paperwork she has sent to congressmen, diplomats, government officials and people who are just interested parties, is a letter that expresses Gubin's case simply.

"In September, 1980, I went to the Soviet Union as the recipient of a Fulbright Hays Fellowship and a participant in the International Research and Exchanges Board [IREX] scholarly exchange program.

"During the course of the 9½ months I spent in the Soviet Union, I met, fell in love with and married Aleksei Pavlovich Lodisev.

"We were married in Kiev on April 17, 1981. My husband has three times been denied permission to come live with me in the United States."

Since that letter, her Russian husband has applied and been turned down a fourth time, but was told he was eligible to reapply next year.

"Most couples receive approval after the first or second application," according to the American woman's experience. "Even the U.S. State Department is flabbergasted at our situation."

Gubin, who is with the Institute for Public Policy Studies at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, cannot fathom the delay, even with her 10 years as a scholar of Russian affairs.

"It makes no sense to me," she said of the rejections, which the Soviet authorities do not bother to explain to Aleksei at the office in Kiev.

"Our case is in accordance with their law. My husband is a computer specialist, but he doesn't know of anything connected with his job that could make him a security problem.

"The Soviet Union has approved of the Madrid Human Rights Agreements and is scheduled to sign them this month. Certainly it is in the interest of the Soviet state to project an image which adheres to its own constitution and laws . . ."

Soviet law does not forbid marriages such as theirs and the Soviet constitution states "each of the spouses is free to select his or her occupation, profession and place of residence."

Gubin also doubts dismay about the South Korean airliner incident and U.S. reaction came quickly enough to cause the refusal Soviet officials handed her husband in the first week of September.

"Maybe there is something in Kiev . . .," she muses aloud.

Lodisev has gone to Moscow hoping to determine whether things are different in the capital.

As for his wife, she writes letters to Andropov that are elegant in their straightforward appeal.

"While I believe very strongly that the reunification of divided spouses is in the interests of the Soviet Union, I have deliberately avoided introducing politics into these letters, she wrote on Aug. 4.

Since there has been no hint of a response to any of her correspondence to the Kremlin, Gubin has no way of knowing whether those brief daily letters of hers are even read.●

CONGRESSMAN TONY P. HALL INTRODUCES HUMAN NEEDS AND WORLD SECURITY ACT

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan group of my colleagues and I are introducing today the Human Needs and World Security Act.

The objective of the legislation is to reform and to reorder foreign assistance spending priorities. The Human Needs and World Security Act proposes to cap or freeze spending for security assistance for fiscal 1985, while making modest increases in selected development and humanitarian aid programs.

I. BACKGROUND

Since 1980, U.S. foreign aid has shifted sharply toward military aid and security-related aid under the economic support fund. Military aid has grown by over 100 percent, and total security assistance—military and ESF combined—has grown 73 percent. In contrast, humanitarian and development aid programs have increased 6 percent, which has been less than the rate of inflation.

In fiscal 1981, a total of $5.3 billion was spent on security assistance, which represented 50.2 percent of all foreign aid. In fiscal 1982, the amount spent on security aid jumped to $7 billion, or 56 percent of total foreign aid. In fiscal 1983, the total rose to $8.5 billion, or 60 percent of all U.S. foreign assistance.

In the recently passed continuing appropriations legislation for fiscal 1984, funding for security assistance totals $9.2 billion, which represents about 63 percent of all U.S. foreign aid.

It is clear that U.S. foreign aid spending is increasing, and a larger and larger portion of that increase is for military-related assistance.

Our citizens are rightly concerned about the need to critically examine all areas of Federal spending in order to reduce the massive deficits projected for the next several years. According to most opinion polls, the average American would select foreign aid as a category which deserves special budgetary scrutiny. Yet that citizen might be surprised to learn that the bulk of foreign aid spending is for military purposes.

Currently, the world spends $22 on military purposes for every $1 it spends on development aid to poor countries. According to the U.N. Center for Disarmament, the money required to provide adequate food, water, education, health, and housing for everyone in the world has been estimated at about $18.5 billion per year. The world spends this much on arms every 2 weeks. In the developing world, 10 times more is spent on arms than on health, education, and welfare combined.

On the average, arms imports account for 59 percent of total Third World imports. In some countries, this has been an important contribution to the debt that is dragging down their economies—which, in turn, affects the industrialized lending nations.

From the perspective of the United States as an arms supplying nation, a General Accounting Office report this year noted that a dozen countries were receiving guaranteed loans, even though they already were in default on prior loans for military assistance.

In 1982, over 43 billion dollars' worth of arms transfer agreements were concluded by arms selling nations to the Third World. Between 1975 and 1982, the value of these transfer agreements was $236.7 billion. Consider the impact on development if just half of this amount, or $118.4 billion, had been channeled to meet basic human needs in recipient countries.

In 1980, 30 developing countries spent more on their military budgets than on health and education combined. In developing countries today, there is one soldier for every 250 people—and 1 doctor for every 3,700. Moreover, the military forces in the Third World are often used to repress poor people and others working in their behalf. Of the 41 military governments identified by the Center for Defense Information as having records of violating their citizens' basic human rights, the United States has supplied arms to 28.

It further should be noted that militarization, war, and famine are closely linked. The famines and food shortages in Bangladesh, 1972; Cambodia, 1979; East Timor, 1979; Somalia, 1980; and Ethiopia, 1983 have all been associated with warfare. In each case, major weapons supplying nations and the United States helped to arm the combatants.

There is, of course, a legitimate need for international security assistance. However, in recent years U.S. foreign aid has emphasized the military component of security assistance to the detriment of the other aspect of the recipient nations' security: the fulfillment of essential human needs. Clearly, hunger, disease, and subhuman living conditions threaten a developing country's stability as much as any real or imagined external military threat.

It is time to reallocate the billions of dollars spent on military aid to address basic human needs in the developing world. Certainly, this is as much in our own security interests as in the recipient nations'. It is the human misery in the Third World that gives rise to the instability and conflict into which the United States is increasingly being drawn militarily.

If it is not possible to shift billions of dollars from security assistance to development assistance, let us at least start in the next fiscal year to limit the unchecked growth in security assistance spending and direct a modest increase—totaling $220 million—to certain essential development programs.

II. SUMMARY OF THE HUMAN NEEDS AND WORLD SECURITY ACT

The Human Needs and World Security Act contains two principal portions. The first objective of the bill is to limit security assistance spending in fiscal 1985 to amounts spent in fiscal 1984. To implement this freeze in the growth of security assistance, the bill places an overall cap on military assistance of $6,261,500,000. This reflects the funding in the continuing appropriations for fiscal 1984 for the combination of foreign military sales credits, foreign military sales guarantees, grant military assistance, and international military education and training. In addition, the bill places a separate cap on economic support fund (ESF) spending, the second component of security assistance, at the continuing appropriations for fiscal 1984 level of $2.9 billion.

The second objective of the bill is to provide small increases over the fiscal 1984 level—as contained in the continuing appropriations legislation—for selected humanitarian and development aid programs. The bill provides an increase of $50 million for the U.N.'s Children's Fund (UNICEF) for the provision of low-cost preventive health measures associated with the "child health revolution" developed by UNICEF and other U.N. agencies. Another $50 million increase is directed to the Agency for International Development's (AID) health care activities for preventive health care, including the provision of safe potable water. The bill directs $40 million for the International Fund for Agricultural Development and $50 million for title II of the Public Law 480 program. Finally, $10 million is to be provided for the Inter-American Development Bank's program for the financing of small projects and an extra $20 million is directed for the activities of the Peace Corps. The total amount of all the increases for humanitarian and development aid programs is $220 million—less than $1 for every person in the United States.

III. EXPLANATION OF THE HUMAN NEEDS AND WORLD SECURITY ACT

Security assistance provisions: It should be emphasized that the bill does not cut security assistance spending. Rather, it limits the amount to be spent in fiscal 1985 to the current fiscal 1984 limits. Security assistance spending already has grown from $5.3 billion in fiscal 1981 to $9.2 billion in fiscal 1984. This legislation requires security assistance to forego an increase in fiscal 1985. At a time when so many other programs are required to sustain cutbacks, it is not unreasonable to not grant an increase next year for security assistance.

The bill does not earmark funding for security assistance to any specific nations. Instead, it provides lump sums of $6.3 billion for military aid and $2.9 billion for economic support fund spending. While it is the intent of the sponsors that funds could not be shifted out of economic support fund spending and into military aid, it would be possible to transfer funds among the military aid categories of foreign military sales credits, foreign military sales guarantees, grant military assistance, and international military education and training.

With respect to grant military assistance, it should be noted that the legislation does not interfere with the President's emergency "draw down" authority in the case of unforeseen needs.

In summary, the bill sets a ceiling for overall security assistance—a very high ceiling based on the increases in recent years—and requires specific funding allocations to be determined within the limits set for military aid and economic support fund spending—the two blocks of total security assistance.

Humanitarian and development aid provisions: Based on current projections, unless limiting legislation is enacted, spending for security assistance in fiscal 1985 will increase by another $900 million.

Under the first portion of the Human Needs and World Security Act, there would be no net increase in overall security assistance spending. Thus, there would be an estimated saving of $900 million—the money that would have been spent without a cap on security assistance, according to some projections.

The bill proposes to reinvest a part of the money saved in programs with a record of benefiting and involving directly poor people within developing countries. That portion would total $220 million. The balance of the money would amount to a savings in the foreign affairs function for the budget—and the taxpayer.

The additional $220 million would be a first step toward a more balanced approach to long-term security in the developing world. It would acknowledge that military assistance alone cannot guarantee a nation's security in the midst of poverty, hunger, and disease.

The $220 million for humanitarian and development aid programs would be allocated as follows:

UNICEF CHILD HEALTH REVOLUTION

The bill proposes an additional $50 million for UNICEF for the provision of low-cost preventive health measures associated with the "child health revolution" developed by UNICEF and other U.N. agencies. Most of the 40,000 children who die every day throughout the world die of the effects of malnutrition, infections, and repeated bouts of diarrhea. It has been estimated that perhaps 20,000 of these children's lives could be saved every day by following the procedures proposed under the child health revolution. Oral rehydration therapy, using a solution of sugar and salt to treat children suffering from diarrhea, is an example of one of these procedures. In Narangwal, India, community health workers using oral rehydration therapy and penicillin have reduced the death rate among young children by half. A $50 million increase in the U.S. contribution to this program could directly result in literally thousands of children's lives being saved. This certainly would be a worthy foreign aid expenditure.

AID HEALTH ACCOUNT

The bill would add $50 million for AID health care activities for preventive health care measures, including the provision of safe potable water. Health spending is perhaps AID's most effective account, delivering direct and lasting benefits to poor people in developing nations. The AID program supports primary health care systems which provide training and supplies to grassroots networks of health volunteers in developing countries. Funding also is used for biomedical research, particularly with respect to malaria and other tropical diseases. It should be noted that an American Public Health Association study of 52 AID-supported health projects in 1982 found changes in the health status of target groups. For example, in some Egyptian villages, infant mortality was reduced by half.

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) is the only international organization that focuses solely on increasing food production in the poorest food deficient countries. The encouraging work it has been performing, merits the additional $40 million proposed in the Human Needs and World Security Act. The International Fund for Agricultural Development is funded primarily by the OECD countries and the OPEC nations. Contributions by OPEC account for 43 percent of IFAD funding, while U.S. contributions account for 17 percent of all funds. After 3 years, the United States has provided only $90 million of a $180 million commitment to IFAD. Since $50 million is scheduled to be contributed by the United States in 1985, the additional $40 million would enable the United States to finally meet its contribution pledge.

PROGRAM FOR THE FINANCING OF SMALL PROJECTS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BANK

The Inter-American Development Bank's (IDB) program for the financing of small projects is aimed at groups of people who have little or no access to credit and who are usually in the lower half of the population. Loans have been made in 21 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, with 75 percent of the loans going to the poorest nations. An earmarked U.S. contribution of $10 million would help to move this program from the experimental stage. This is the type of self-help program that can generate many positive spinoffs in the poorest countries of this hemisphere. For example, the 4-H Club of Costa Rica has established a program of credits to sons and daughters of farmers in the Costa Rican countryside. Each $1 of loans has generated over $2 of income. The agricultural and loan experience has helped these young people to develop their farming skills.

PEACE CORPS

The Human Needs and World Security Act proposes an increase of $20 million for the Peace Corps. As a former Peace Corps volunteer in Thailand, I can attest to the many benefits of the Peace Corps program. Through the Peace Corps, we provide developing nations with our most important resources: our own people. I know that both our own country and the recipient countries reap benefits from this people-to-people program. The returning volunteers bring back much to share with their fellow Americans, while sharing their expertise and American values with the host countries.

TITLE II OF PUBLIC LAW 480

This legislation would add $50 million for title II of Public Law 480. Under title II, U.S. agricultural commodities are distributed in developing countries by private and church agencies. Most assistance is either for emergencies or used in institutional settings such as health clinics or school lunch programs. Since title II assistance is managed and distributed by private voluntary organizations, they are in a position to minimize the potential negative effects on native farmers' prices, and to maximize the nutritional benefit to the most vulnerable groups like women and small children. According to the U.N.'s Food and Agriculture Organization, 22 African countries are facing catastrophic food shortages in what may be "the worst drought of the century." The FAO is requesting food aid, in addition to already scheduled commercial purchases and aid pledges, that equals nearly half of the present title II program. Food aid will not solve Africa's long-term nutritional problems. However, it can save the lives of people in immediate need, and help affected countries to rebuild their own grain reserves, creating a buffer against further shortages.

IV. CONCLUSION

The time has come to check the unchallenged growth of the security assistance component of foreign aid. The Human Needs and World Security Act proposes to cap security assistance funding in fiscal 1985 at the fiscal 1984 levels, and to make selected increases in worthy and promising humanitarian and development aid programs. These increases, totaling $220 million or less than $1 for every person in the United States, would represent a strong step in the direction of reordering foreign aid spending priorities and promoting the security and stability of developing nations. The real security threat in most of the countries arises from the problems of hunger, poverty, and disease. World security may be best served by efforts to address basic human needs in the Third World.

This legislation, a project of bread for the world, should be studied and considered by all my colleagues. I seek and urge wide cosponsorship so that the provisions of the Human Needs and World Security Act will receive favorable action during consideration of the foreign aid budget for fiscal 1985.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the text of the legislation follows:

H.R. 4440

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Human Needs and World Security Act".

FINDINGS REGARDING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, HUMAN NEEDS, AND WORLD SECURITY

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) over 800 million people in the developing countries live in conditions of absolute poverty which deny them the opportunity to work productively or to obtain adequate nutrition, health care, education, and other basic human needs;

(2) because of the suffering that this entails, and because countries where poverty, hunger, and inequality are the greatest have often been the most vulnerable to violent political and social upheaval, it is both a moral responsibility and in the interest of the United States to support programs and activities that provide direct and lasting benefit to hungry and impoverished people in the developing countries;

(3) spending for security assistance to the developing countries has grown rapidly in recent years without corresponding investments in the long term development of the people of these countries; and

(4) in a period of rising budget deficits, more modest foreign aid spending and a more balanced approach to security assistance and development assistance are both in the interest of the United States.

INCREASED DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. (a) For the fiscal year 1985—

(1) not less than $102,000,000 shall be provided under chapter 3 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to the United Nations Children's Fund, with the funds which are in excess of the funds provided under that chapter to that organization for the fiscal year 1984 to be devoted to the provision of low-cost preventive health measures associated with "the child health revolution" developed by the United Nations Children's Fund and other United Nations agencies;

(2) not less than $90,000,000 shall be provded under section 103(g) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the International Fund for Agricultural Development; and

(3) not less than $175,000,000 shall be provided under section 104(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for health care activities, with the funds which are in excess of the funds provided for such purpose for the fiscal year 1984 to be devoted to preventive health care activities, including the provision of safe potable water, directly benefiting the poor majority.

(b) For the fiscal year 1985, there is authorized to be appropriated not less than $135,000,000 for the Peace Corps.

(c) For the fiscal year 1985, not less than $700,000,000 shall be available for expenses of carrying out title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

(d) For the fiscal year 1985, there is authorized to be appropriated not less than $10,000,000 for payment to the Inter-American Development Bank for use for assistance under the Bank's Program for the Financing of Small Projects.

LIMITATION ON SECURITY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the aggregate of—

(1) the total amount of credits (or participation in credits) extended under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (foreign military sales credits); and

(2) the total principal amount of loans guaranteed under section 24(a) of the Arms Export Control Act (foreign military sales guarantees); and

(3) the total funds used for assistance provided under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (grant military assistance); and

(4) the total funds used for assistance provided under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (international military education and training);

shall not exceed $6,261,500,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, assistance provided under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (economic support fund) shall not exceed $2,900,000 for the fiscal year 1985.●

JACOBS SPARED PANEL DEMOTION

HON. FRANK McCLOSKEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, ANDY JACOBS, knows firsthand the horrible price of war. He is a disabled combat veteran of Marine infantry service.

Though he favors ferocious combat to protect the United States from actual danger of armed attack, he disagreed with both Presidents Johnson and Nixon over U.S. participation in the Vietnam war. He also disagreed with President Carter over the ill-fated raid in Iran. And he disagrees with President Reagan over American combat commitment in Lebanon and over the armed invasion of Grenada. Whether one agrees with ANDY JACOBS or not, the last thing people who know him would accuse him of is blind partisanship. No one knows this better than the Democratic leadership. As can be seen in the following Indianapolis Star article, he goes further than some Democratic leaders might think reasonable in being fair with Republican Members in floor proceedings.

Because of this, it is unfortunate, uninformed, and unfair for anyone to question ANDY JACOBS' motives and suggest anything less than an honest disagreement with the administration over contemporary U.S. military combat in other countries.

Most people, including our Republican colleague, ELWOOD HILLIS, would say that ANDY JACOBS is one of the least partisan Members of Congress.

I insert the following articles from the Indianapolis Star of January 9, 1981, and the Indianapolis News article of November 9, 1983.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Jan. 9, 1981]

JACOBS SPARED PANEL DEMOTION

WASHINGTON.—The Democratic Steering and Policy Committee of the House of Representatives decided Thursday not to punish Rep. ANDREW JACOBS (D-Ind.) for jumping the party line on a procedural vote during the opening day of Congress.

JACOBS was one of only three Democrats who voted with Republicans on a motion to "order the previous question"—thereby ending amendment and debate on the adoption of the House rules for the 97th Congress.

Rep. RICHARD BOLLING (D-Mo.), chairman of the Rules Committee and a member of the Steering and Policy Committee, urged the panel to recommend to the Democratic Caucus that JACOBS and Rep. LARRY McDONALD (D-Ga.) be deprived of their committee seniority and relegated to the House District Committee, a kind of limbo reserved for the lowest-ranking freshmen.

The third errant Democrat, Rep. CHARLES ROEMER (D-La.), a freshman who pleaded ignorance and promised not to stray again, was forgiven by the policy group.

JACOBS, on the recommendation of Rep. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI (D-Ill.), chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, wrote an explanation of his position to Speaker THOMAS P. (TIP) O'NEILL, JR. (D-Mass.), who was not keen about disciplining JACOBS.

Learning that the Steering and Policy Committee will recommend to the Democratic Caucus that he be accorded his seniority and seat on the Ways and Means Committee, JACOBS said, "Evidently being in favor of democracy does not violate Democratic principles after all."

He said he voted out of conscience against ordering the previous question because he thought the Republicans had a right to be heard on their demand for a better ratio of memberships on standing committees.

[From the Indianapolis News, Nov. 9, 1983]

GOP ASKS ANDY

(By David Mannweiler)

Indiana congressman ANDY JACOBS, JR., wasn't on the election ballot yesterday, but that didn't matter to the National Republican Congressional Committee.

It took a swipe at JACOBS last week, anyway.

The NRCC, which is working to promote the election of Republican congressional candidates across the country, took exception to comments JACOBS made on the floor of the House of Representatives after the Grenadian invasion/rescue mission.

The NRCC cranked up its news press machinery and slapped this headline on a release: "JACOBS Says American Lives Were Not Endangered In Grenada; Student Says, 'God Bless America.'"

The release repeated JACOBS' comments that "the American lives that were in danger in Grenada apparently were not the ones who were already there (meaning the American medical students at St. George's School of Medicine). The American lives endangered on Grenada were those who were sent there to die, and did die (meaning the American soldiers)."

After quoting JACOBS' comments, the NRCC then quoted an unnamed rescued student as saying, "God bless America, God bless Reagan, God bless our military."

Rep. THOMAS HARTNETT, R-S.C., jumped into the act, and the news release, at this point.

"Perhaps a little less partisanship might be in order for Rep. JACOBS," HARTNETT said.

"Here we have American soldiers, sailors and Marines engaging heavily-armed Cubans in combat and Rep. JACOBS directs his comments at the President of the United States rather than the role being played by the Cubans and their cohorts who took over the island a week ago," HARTNETT continued.

"The students themselves, upon their safe return to U.S. soil, have said that this action was necessary to protect their safety. If anyone had asked the employes of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran 24 hours before the students came over the wall if they were in physical danger, they might have said no.

"But if President Carter had acted in a similar, decisive fashion, we might not have had to endure the humiliation of having State Department professionals held hostage for 444 days.

"I hope," HARTNETT added, "this will serve as a lesson to Rep. JACOBS, but I doubt it. Perhaps, though, Rep. JACOBS' comments in a time of national crisis will be remembered by the voters next November."

A little less partisanship, Mr. HARTNETT?

SALUTE TO VINCENT ARLOTTA, PATRIOT, LEADER, AND HUMANITARIAN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1984, in New York, the very distinguished executive director of the Queens Chapter American Red Cross in Greater New York, who is the warm and loving humanitarian Vincent Arlotta, will be retiring his post, after 46 years of service to the people of the city of New York, 20 years as a member of the New York City Police Department's Mounted Division, and 26 years as a volunteer and staff member of the American Red Cross. His devotion to civic duty and his dedication to the causes of the needy have been extraordinary in the annals of New York public service. In light of his exceptional direction and accomplishment, Vincent Arlotta will be specially honored, and his work acknowledged, at the Queens Chapter Gala Dinner Ball on December 7. I believe it very fitting that we, as the Congress of the United States, join in saluting Vincent Arlotta on that date, as a great American, a proud New Yorker, and distinguished public servant.

Only an outstanding individual like Vincent Arlotta could give so much of himself for the American Red Cross for over a quarter century. It is that special brand of personal and public service for the beneficiaries of the American Red Cross that we honor here today. Vincent Arlotta began as a hard-working volunteer, and served in that capacity for 10 years with the Queens and Manhattan chapters from 1957 to 1967. In October 1967, he was appointed as supervisor of the Bronx chapter, a special recognition of his leadership talents, and led the Bronx Service Center until his appointment as manager of the Queens North Shore chapter in December 1969. He became director of the Central Queens chapter in November 1973, while remaining director of the North Shore chapter; 1977 saw him assume the executive directorship of the Queens chapter, where he has served so admirably at the helm until the present day.

Vincent Arlotta's service for his community also includes achievements with organizations concerned for our youth, our elderly, and social, civic, fraternal, and religious concerns. He has served as vice chairman of the Southeast Queens Consortium of Aging Services, as board member and financial secretary of the Queens Council for Social Welfare, and as a member of the Queens Chamber of Commerce Health and Safety Committee. He is a past distinguished president and distinguished secretary of the Kiwanis Club of Flushing, and a board member of the Flushing Boys Club, the Jamaica Service Program for Older Adults, and a member of the Advisory Council Queensborough Public Library and the Queens Interagency Council on Aging. Additionally, Vincent Arlotta has been a past president of the Flushing First Friday Group, and is a lector and Eucharistic minister of his church. Almost too numerous to mention, our honoree has helped and worked with many other Queens organizations.

Born in Manhattan, New York City, on November 18, 1921, and educated at New York schools, Guardian Angel Grammar School, the High School of Commerce, City College of New York, and Fordham University, Vincent Arlotta also had a long and meritorious 20-year career with New York's finest, the New York City Police Department. Briefly assigned as a probationary officer with the 34th precinct in 1947, he was to spend his police career as a member of the Mounted Division, working out of troop B in the Times Square, Waterfront, and Village areas.

Vincent Arlotta is a U.S. Army veteran, having served our country for 4 years during World War II with the 102d Infantry Division in the United States and Europe. He was honorably discharged in January 1946 as a staff sergeant.

Our congratulations go out to Vincent Arlotta on the culmination of his distinguished career for the Red Cross, our country, and the community. To him, and his wonderful family, wife, Josephine, children, Darlene, Vincent, and Francine, and grandchildren, Matthew, Jeffrey, Vincent, Gregory, Adrienne, and Jessica, we extend our best wishes for continued success, and happy, productive lives.●

CELEBRATING GREENPOINT: ITS PAST, ITS FLAG AND ITS FUTURE

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, when the House of Representatives passed my resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge, many of my colleagues who spoke in favor of the resolution, talked about the enduring qualities of the bridge—its solidity, its workmanship, the innovation which, in its time, the construction of the bridge represented. The celebration which the borough and New York City sponsored, which so many of my colleagues attended, was truly one of the great events of the year.

However, another anniversary was celebrated in the Greenpoint community of Brooklyn, which symbolized many of the same attributes the bridge has come to represent. Greenpoint, on June 6, paused to remember the 16th anniversary of the official dedication of the Greenpoint flag, the first community flag of the United States.

Family, tradition, love of neighborhood—these are the enduring qualities of Greenpoint which the flag symbolizes. I like to think that Brooklyn generally, and the community of Greenpoint specifically, is an area which honors, pays tribute and, most importantly, keeps alive these kinds of values. This is particularly noteworthy because, as we all know too well, these are values which are so often lost in a society which is buffered, as ours is, by rapid change, technological advancement, and the mobility of population that often means rootlessness in today's world.

Because Greenpoint continues to hold these values dear, I wanted to share some information with my colleagues about this remarkable community—its past, its flag, and its future.

Greenpoint, which is located in the section of Brooklyn directly across the East River from Manhattan's Lower East Side, was purchased in 1638 by the Dutch West India Co. from a tribe known as the Canarsie Indians.

By the time of America's revolution, Greenpoint was settled by five prominent families of Dutch descent, who maintained active farms there.

In 1840, the ferry to Manhattan was instituted, and the shipbuilding industry was organized there. Until 1880, shipbuilding employed half the local population which numbered about 30,000. On Greenpoint's docks, such famous ships as the *Grand Republic*, the *Adirondeck*, and *Henrik Hudson*, were built. Iron ships were fabricated, including the forerunners of the famed *Monitor*.

Besides ships, Greenpoint became known, in the 19th century, as the "Carousel Capitol" of the world. The first U.S. patent for a carousel was awarded to a Greenpoint resident named E. S. Scripture.

As technology, and the routes on which ships carried cargo, changed, Greenpoint's industrial base became dominated by fine pottery works, glass works, and oil refineries. The largest oil and gas storage depots in the city are located there. Ironworks, the remaining firms which deal in the shipbuilding trade, manufacturers and other companies now enliven its industrial area. Several industries, taking advantage of the assistance provided by the North Brooklyn Development Corp., are relocating to Greenpoint.

But traditional elements have not been swept away by progress. Greenpoint's streets are still lined with brick and brownstone row houses built after the Civil War. Its churches, many built in the late 19th century, present fine examples of Romanesque Revival style architecture. But, tradition in the best sense—that is represented in the lifestyle and customs of the community—is Greenpoint's most important asset.

The story behind the Greenpoint flag demonstrates this point.

On February 10, 1967, the Greenpoint Weekly Star carried a story titled "Flag Entry Deadline March 30." The newspaper reported that the Greenpoint Civic Council Flag Committee had set a deadline for a contest they had planned: They were soliciting applications and designs for a flag that, once chosen, would be the first community flag in America. The council members—Joseph Savino, Ralph Carrano, Cathy Meyers, Ray Mizgalski, Hyman Shiffer, Mary Driscoll, Frank J. Waskiewicz, and Edwin Duffy—appealed to the community for their entries.

Rather than selecting the winning design in some backroom, the council, with cooperation from the newspaper, proposed a typically democratic procedure—the community would vote by submitting ballots printed in the Greenpoint Star. Four proposed designs, each of which pictured in editions of the paper, appeared on the ballot.

The top vote getter was submitted by a young woman named Ann Kandratino, the granddaughter of Russian immigrants, and she was heralded in the community as "Greenpoint's 'Betsy Ross'."

On June 7, 1967, the flag—depicting a scene on the East River, with the buildings of Greenpoint in silhouette, pictured on a white background—was raised for the first time. It was an extraordinary celebration. Our former colleague, Mayor John V. Lindsay, spent the afternoon touring the neighborhoods of Greenpoint. It was a remarkable and memorable day for the community.

Ten years later, Brooklyn Borough President Howard Golden signed a proclamation commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Greenpoint flag. He said, in part, that the concept behind the process to design the flag was "to provide motivation to stabilize and unite all community residents of all ethnic backgrounds harmoniously under a single standard to perpetuate the ideal of safeguarding democracy and freedom for all American communities."

That is exactly what has happened. The flag is still flying. And this wonderful community remains united. It contains a marvelous diversity of individuals from varying ethnic backgrounds, with their own traditions and customs. But when all is said and done, it is a tightly knit community, working to preserve, protect, and improve its quality of life, for now and for the future.

In this the 16th year of the Greenpoint flag, as the Congressman representing the community, I salute Greenpoint and the strength of its commitments to the values which make our people and our Nation great.●

FEDERAL SPENDING AND FEDERAL DEFICIT

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have received a timely letter from Paul J. Martin, president of Martin-Thompson Inc., Owensboro, Ky., with regard to his concern about the Federal spending policies and the rising Federal deficit.

Mr. Martin is supportive of efforts to establish a bipartisan commission to reduce the deficit. I believe my colleagues will be interested in his comments, and the letter follows:

MARTIN-THOMPSON, INC.,
Owensboro, Ky., October 26, 1983.

CARROLL HUBBARD, Jr.,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: They tell me you haven't heard from the public so you don't think we are worried over the reckless federal spending and massive deficits.

Wrong!

I, for one, am fed up with the inactivity, the partisan politics and the finger pointing on the deficit issue. I want you to vote for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to reduce the federal deficit. That commission must make its recommendations no later than the beginning of the year. Then I want you to vote to reduce the deficit before the election.

You must act now to defuse the deficit time bomb!

Sincerely yours,

PAUL J. MARTIN,
President.●

COMMENDING THE JUVENILE JUSTICE CONNECTION PROJECT

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the staff and the board of directors of the Juvenile Justice Connection Project.

The JJCP is performing vitally needed community work with juveniles who are in trouble with the law in the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles. The project is extremely successful in that it involves the entire community in diverting youths from lives of crime to lives of useful citizenship.

By bringing youth serving programs, agencies, and individuals with special expertise into the juvenile justice system to work with the courts, probation officials, and the schools, JJCP is making a difference in the San Fernando Valley. JJCP provides support for young people, giving them the strength to change their ways before they become a threat to themselves and society.

JJCP is making our community safer from youthful offenders. The staff directs young people in need of help to the appropriate program to solve their problems. In so doing, they help to eliminate the tremendous potential that is wasted when a juvenile is allowed to continue to break the law and is eventually incarcerated. They help to return these individuals to society as productive, contributing citizens. Finally, the JJCP also saves us tax dollars by seeking ways to keep juveniles at home while they are receiving help or are on probation, rather than having us pay to place the offender in juvenile hall or some other tax-supported facility.

Mr. Speaker, the Juvenile Justice Connection Project is focusing national attention on the San Fernando Valley. I am proud of the work that they are doing for our community, and I would like to call the other Members' attention to this outstanding project.

I wish the staff and board of directors of the JJCP the best of luck and continued success in the future.●

TVI ENERGY CORP.

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the TVI Energy Corp., a small, young technology company which has just turned its first profit, after a 5-year research and development stage. TVI is located in Beltsville, Md., in the northern part of my Fifth Congressional District.

TVI is a leading designer and manufacturer of Energy-Kote radiant heating panels. By using these panels, thermostats can be set an average of 6° to 8° lower than required with conventional central hot air systems and produce equivalent comfort levels in rooms. According to the company, the panels can be used with existing heating systems, or as the prime heating source, without costly plumbing or ductwork alterations, and reduce heating bills from 30 to 50 percent for both residential and commercial use.

TVI has developed a micro-thin composition of lamellar graphite and copper conductors, laminated between two layers of "Mylar" polyester and bonded to rigid, nonflammable insulation board to form a continuous heating element. The panels use low amperage to generate radiant heat directly to room occupants in less than 4 minutes from initial startup, and enables users to reduce wasteful heating of unoccupied rooms or areas when not in use.

These panels have already been ordered for two HUD-sponsored projects, one in Baltimore. The company has entered into an agreement with Mitsui & Co., Ltd. of Japan to conduct a marketing feasibility study of the panels in Japan and Korea.

In addition, TVI manufactures infrared thermal signature targets used by the military. They are the major supplier to the U.S. Army, and have appointed Saab-Scania of Sweden to sell and distribute their signature targets and related equipment for military use in certain NATO countries.

TVI employs approximately 52 people in the Beltsville plant, and it is actively involved in efforts to improve its operating procedures and its management to increase its marketing effort.

Mr. Speaker, it is often said that small business is the real backbone of the American economy. Its struggles, its challenges, its successes and failures are a reflection of all our efforts as this Nation works to build and expand its economic base. Through perserverance, hard work and some tough management decisions, TVI has come to a point of positive return. This young company has a bright future ahead of it, and I look forward to TVI playing a leading role in its effort to provide real answers to the energy problems we face today.●

SUBSIDIZED HOUSING: THE NEED IS GREAT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, now that the logjam has apparently been broken, and the reauthorization of our Nation's housing and community development programs is imminent, I feel it is imperative that I speak out on an issue of great concern to the residents of my district in south central Los Angeles, concentrations of subsidized housing in certain portions of a community.

Shortages of subsidized housing are not unique to my area. The problem is one that confronts most of our country's urban areas. Thousands of eligible citizens have been unable to obtain affordable housing simply because the need far outstrips the availability.

Currently only about one-tenth of those deemed eligible have been lucky enough to be placed in subsidized housing units. In Los Angeles, the vacancy rate hovers between 1 and 2 percent. Because of budgetary constraints, the situation is not expected to improve dramatically in the foreseeable future.

Citizens of my district believe HUD should insure, through regulations, that proper planning and advance notice is given to the community when a project is proposed for the area. Citizen input must be solicited in order to provide the best possible location of a project.

Low-income housing projects should not be concentrated in any one particular neighborhood or community. Planning assistance grants should be revived. I call on HUD to address this problem in a timely and equitable fashion.●

CONGRATULATING DR. MOZAFFAR BAKHCHI

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Mozaffar Bakhchi, who will receive the Humanitarian Award of the National Committee for Furtherance of Jewish Education on this Sunday, November 20. Dr. Bakhchi is being honored for his tireless volunteer efforts on behalf of countless disadvantaged individuals in medical need.

This selection of Dr. Bakhchi comes as no surprise to me. I have known him for many years. He has been the pediatrician for my three children, and I have watched with admiration and gratitude as he catered to their medical needs. Dr. Bakhchi's story is a remarkable one, which I would like now to relate to you.

Mr. Speaker, Mozaffar Bakhchi was born in Tehran, Iran, and received his medical education at the renowned Sorbonne in Paris, France, from which he was graduated in 1957. After getting his degree, Dr. Bakhchi quickly established himself as a dedicated medical practitioner and a compassionate and caring citizen of the United States. Dr. Bakhchi opened his private practice in Forest Hills, N.Y., in 1965, but has also found time to be a clinical instructor in pediatric medicine at Downstate Medical School of the State University of New York, in Brooklyn. Although his practice and his academic obligations required a significant amount of his valuable time, Dr. Bakhchi has demonstrated his dedication for those in medical need and moral support by being a true "tzadik"—a man of charity. In 1979, when the Shah of Iran was overthrown, Dr. Bakhchi was instrumental in evacuating over 1,000 Iranian children, helping them adjust to life in the United States, and providing them with free medical care. Dr. Bakhchi has also donated medical equipment to the infirmaries at the two schools sponsored by the National Committee for Furtherance of Jewish Education, Hadar Hatorah and Machon L'Yadus, both in Brooklyn.

Just a few short weeks ago, I was in need of an interpreter as well as a physician in order to assist Iranian twin brothers who were beaten in an anti-Semitic attack while being kept in detention by the Immigration Service. Dr. Bakhchi filled both roles. He immediately rescheduled patients and rushed with me to the Federal detention facility to help correct a great injustice.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Mozaffar Bakhchi is a fine example of an individual who makes his community and Nation a strong, healthy and compassionate place in which to live, work, play, and raise a family. Mozaffar is an asset to his community and the medical profession. He is a person of outstanding dedication whose praiseworthy contributions serve as an inspiration to all of us. I ask the Members of the Congress of the United States to join me in lauding Dr. Mozaffar Bakhchi for his outstanding efforts on behalf of his community and the Nation.●

THE EUROPEAN NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS: PATHS TO WAR OR PEACE?

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to my colleagues an excellent legal brief entitled "The European Nuclear Negotiations: Paths to War or Peace?" prepared by Mr. Alan B. Sherr, President of the Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control.

Mr. Speaker, we are headed for a disasterous situation in Europe.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union are in a hole over the INF question—and the only solution either side has come up with so far is to keep digging.

Everybody in this town just assumes that once the United States begins deploying the Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe, the Soviets are going to come meekly crawling to the negotiating table and bargain for reductions.

I would like for the movie to end that way—I really would. But I do not think the Soviets are going to follow the script, because it assumes that Yuriy Andropov's spine is weaker than Ronald Reagan's spine.

Now I do not know what Mr. Andropov's ailment is, but you can be darn sure it is not going to cause him to cave in on the Euromissiles.

No, when the United States begins deploying the Pershing II and cruise missile, the Soviets have all but taken a blood oath to walk out of the INF talks for good and to put the United States under the same quick-strike threat that the Pershing's pose for the Soviets.

They may put SS-22's in East Germany and Czechoslovakia. Those missiles would be 2½ minutes from their targets in the West. Our Pershings would be 8 minutes from their targets.

If that happens, we are really going to enter the Atari generation. We will have to rely more on computerized early warning systems because reaction times would be too short for human decisions.

I do not think this is a situation anybody wants.

I am worried we are entering into an era of confrontation with the Soviet Union when we desperately need to be entering an era of negotiation.

If Mr. Reagan continues this confrontation the way he has in the past he will go down in history as the first President not to meet with the Soviet leadership since Herbert Hoover.

And if the INF and START talks blow up in our face as they may well do with this deployment, Mr. Reagan may also have the dubious distinction of being the first post-World War II President not to sign an arms limitation agreement with the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the RECORD the introduction and conclusion to the superb legal argument prepared by the Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control. This organization under the leadership of Mr. Alan Sherr is based in Boston, Mass., and in my opinion will go down in history as one of the most effective voices for rational analysis of the nuclear arms race in this country.

INTRODUCTION

At the outset of a recent major trial involving automobile insurance rates, the judge confessed to counsel that she was already suffering the initial stages of the "ME-GO" syndrome. The reference was to the "my eyes glaze over" phenomenon. It is a common affliction in matters of great technical complexity in which opposing arguments are couched primarily in terms of "facts and figures."

Many people approach the issue of nuclear forces in Europe with similar trepidation. Treatments of the issue too frequently become mired in numbers—for example, comparisons of NATO and Warsaw Pact force levels—without adequately establishing how the figures came to be, why they are important, and what they imply for the future. Such analyses and arguments encourage the belief, shared by many in the United States, that the question of European nuclear deployments is too technical and fact-oriented to be judged by non-experts. Many Americans also appear to believe that this question is not so directly linked to their interests as are "domestic" arms issues, such as whether to build the MX missile.

Both beliefs are incorrect. Moreover, they are dangerous. Although the European issue is admittedly a complex one, it is possible for non-experts both to understand it and to develop informed, independent conclusions. It is essential that we in the United States make these efforts because, in the nuclear age, America would inevitably be an extension of any "European nuclear battlefield." The Atlantic insulates us more from the debate than from the military reality; we can ignore this reality only at our own peril.

This brief—one in a series on nuclear arms control issues published by the Lawyers Alliance—surveys the history of nuclear arms deployments and nuclear arms negotiations in Europe. The reader is likely to reach two basic conclusions based on this history: (1) the nuclear arms race in Europe is accelerating; and (2) negotiations have thus far failed to move much beyond the stage of public posturing. But the failure of negotiations is due to a lack of serious commitment by the superpowers, not to unavoidable obstacles. As the concluding sections of the brief argue, the self-interests of the parties are not irreconcilable—to the contrary, there is sufficient overlap of interests to support an effective and lasting agreement. This brief will describe those interests and suggest some approaches for breaking out of the current impasse. Time is running out, however. Unless informed public opinion succeeds in forcing a reassessment of present NATO and Soviet policies, Europe and the world will be carried closer to nuclear catastrophe.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

There is no magic formula that all interested parties could instantly recognize as a solution to the complex problem of nuclear arms in Europe. Even under the best of circumstances, it will take time to work through a number of tough issues: how to count dual-capable weapons which could deliver either nuclear or conventional explosives; how to guard against rapid conversion of intermediate-range missiles into intercontinental-range ones; how to control shorter-range nuclear missiles that could be moved into range of Western Europe; where to draw the line between medium-range bombers and shorter-range aircraft that could deliver nuclear bombs; how to verify compliance—to give just a few examples.

But it is not necessary to agree on an end point in order to make a beginning. What is needed at this stage is agreement on general approaches or, even more fundamentally, on principles that should guide the general approaches. The following three principles could put the superpowers back on the path to productive negotiations and peace rather than the present road to conflict.

Principle No. 1: Take off the pressure.

Principle No. 2: Move toward stability.

Principle No. 3: Remove artificial obstacles.

1. Take off the pressure

Time is now working against agreement. Once the Soviets are faced with the deployment of a significant fraction of the planned 108 Pershing II missiles, the political benefits to them of allowing dissension in Western Europe to grow may well outweigh the marginal military cost of additional Pershing II deployments. If, as they have warned, the Soviets retaliate in some way for the new NATO weapons, the NATO allies will be reluctant to take steps which might be interpreted as backing down. This does not mean that negotiations will not be possible. It does mean that talks will become even more complex and that momentum will shift decidedly in favor of a renewed nuclear arms race in Europe.

There is time, even after initial deployments in late 1983 but before both sides have dug themselves in too deeply, to avoid this mutually destructive result. If both sides were committed to finding common ground, a framework of an agreement might be reached based on the "walk-in-the-woods" compromise with which both parties are already familiar—and which each accuses the other of rejecting. A better alternative would be to defer NATO deployments, or freeze and then remove those weapons already in place, in return for commencement of Soviet reductions. This approach could be implemented without giving the Soviets an incentive to drag out negotiations indefinitely.

NATO could defer or freeze deployments during a two-year period of negotiations in return for a Soviet agreement to freeze all of its nuclear weapons in Europe and to destroy a set number of intermediate-range missiles (or warheads) per month. Because the older SS-4s and 5s are already being eliminated, the agreement should require that at least half of the missiles destroyed be SS-20s. NATO could agree that, in the event a final settlement was not reached after this two-year period, its planned deployment of 572 missiles would nonetheless be reduced by the number of SS-20 missiles that the Soviet Union had destroyed. If the Soviets refuse such an interim plan on the ground that they cannot accept *any* American missiles in Europe, even potentially, they may find acceptable a variant of this plan after initial NATO deployment have become a fact of life. NATO could propose the destruction of deployed Pershing IIs and GLCMs as Soviet missiles are destroyed and, after all the deployed Pershing IIs and GLCMs were gone, Soviet reductions would continue until they were down to the agreed-upon level.

2. Move toward stability

Both superpowers have much to gain in reaching agreement on the nature and number of intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe. The worst thing that either side can do is to take actions which could undermine the future potential for agreement. Unfortunately, deployment of ground-launched cruise missiles in Europe will have just that effect. Relatively large mobile missile systems, such as the SS-20 and its launcher, or even the Pershing II complexes, can still be located and counted with "national technical means" of verification, such as satellite photography. Cruise missiles, however, greatly increase the problem of verification because of their extremely small size (they are about 20 feet long) and high mobility. Even though cruise missiles also require launchers and support equipment, there is a substantial chance that a nation intent on hiding them could do so successfully unless the parties agreed on far more intrusive measures of verification than they now employ. NATO may not be concerned about this problem now, but it will likely have a different view when the Soviets respond with their own strategic nuclear GLCMs. Once GLCMs are deployed by the hundreds or thousands throughout Europe, it will be very difficult to reach a verifiable agreement recalling them. In a manner of speaking, deployments of GLCMs thus undermine the "stability" of nuclear arms control.

Just as the United States belately discovered that multiple-warhead missiles are destabilizing, it will someday realize the destabilizing nature of GLCMs (in relation to arms control) and Pershing IIs (in relation to a first-strike potential). It is hoped that the Soviet Union will come to the same conclusions regarding GLCMs and missiles such as the SS-20. Both superpowers would be well served to adopt as a negotiating principle the desirability of eliminating this dual threat to stability and security.

3. Remove artificial obstacles

When NATO made its dual-track decision in 1979, the allies expected that the INF negotiations would be made "in the framework" of SALT II. It was only because of the collapse of the SALT process that the INF negotiations were undertaken as a separate enterprise. Based on recent history, NATO should now appreciate that keeping INF issues separate from the general context of strategic nuclear arms negotiations will probably cause problems. The experience of allowing, or even encouraging, the Soviets to deploy SS-20 missiles because they did not count against the missile ceilings established in SALT (the "SALT/SS-20 connection") should serve as a warning of the dangers of piecemeal arms control. Similarly, Western leaders' fears of "de-coupling" from the U.S. based on the potential for a "separate peace" between the superpowers (the "SALT/Euromissile connection") should be a reminder of the potentials for intra-alliance tensions due to artificial separation of "strategic" and "theater" issues. It is not too late to learn these lessons. If an interim INF agreement is not quickly forthcoming, the superpowers should agree on the principle of merging INF and SALT.

Merger would provide important advantages to both sides. The Soviets could directly address their concern that NATO's INF modernization is merely another route to achieving strategic nuclear superiority otherwise foreclosed by SALT. West Europeans could feel more secure that their interests would not be "de-coupled" from those of the United States. An even more important benefit would be the possibility of neutralizing the divisive issue of how British and French forces shoud be counted. In a purely European context, these weapons are a significant factor. They are presently a very small factor, however, when compared to the overall balance of American and Soviet forces. If British and French weapons were taken into account in an expanded START negotiation, the U.S. would not need to be concerned about allowing the Soviets parity with all the Western powers. The American contribution would be so dominant that British and French forces would be a minor issue. Even so, the Soviets could not complain that the British and French forces were not being taken into account. Neither side would lose face and both would gain.

The importance of these three principles is that they present real opportunities for progress without requiring the fact or appearance of major concessions. Responsible people have proposed a number of specific and well-thought-out plans for controlling and reducing nuclear arms in Europe. The immediate task of the parties involved in the INF negoitiations is to create a environment in which these plans have a chance to bear fruit.●

CONGRESSIONAL MEMORIAM TO THE HONORABLE C. WILLIAM HOFMANN, JR. OF NEW JERSEY UPON THE DEDICATION OF THE C. WILLIAM HOFMANN, JR. RECREATION COMPLEX, RINGWOOD, N.J.

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 21, 1983 an esteemed mayor, outstanding community leader and good friend, the Honorable C. William Hofmann, Jr. of Ringwood, N.J., went to his eternal rest. During the forthcoming weekend of observance of our national holiday of Thanksgiving, on Saturday, November 26, the people of the Borough of Ringwood, N.J. in testimony to his personal commitment, hard work, and unselfish dedication that he so willingly and ably devoted to the quality of life and way of life in their community will formally dedicate their new Borough Hall Park in his honor with the commemorative inscription: "The C. William Hofmann, Jr. Recreation Complex."

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege to join with the Honorable Mayor Peter Cannici and all of the citizens of Ringwood in seeking this congressional memoriam to Bill Hofmann and I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join in extending our most sincere condolences to his family: his good wife, Mary; son, C. William III; daughters, Patricia, Jennifer, Kathleen, and Ann Marie; and sisters, Patricia Lee of Iselin, N.J.; Shirley Hofmann of Clearwater, Fla.; Candace Kennedy of Vincentown, N.J., and Barbara DeVita of Newark, N.J.

Bill Hofmann can truly be lauded and held in the highest esteem for his lifetime of outstanding accomplishments and good deeds in service to people. His being called to his eternal rest at the young age of 46 years culminated a lengthy scroll of good works and devotion to the needs of people that will forever serve as an inspiration to all of us in his life's purpose and fulfillment. He was labeled a giant in the community by his peers and colleagues and all of us who had the good fortune to know him.

Charles William Hofmann was born in Orange, N.J. and resided in Livingston, N.J. before moving to Cupsaw Lake, Ringwood 15 years ago. He was an administrator for the IBM Corp. for the last 23 years. He served as a borough councilman from 1976 to 1978 and as mayor from 1979 to 1981. Since the early 1970's he served on the Planning Ringwood Board of Education and also served on the Planning Board, Environmental Commission, and was chairman of the Homestead-ing Committee actively involved in rehabilitation programs throughout the borough.

Just prior to his passing, Bill received the Ringwood Chamber of Commerce's first honorary life membership for his leadership efforts in the business community. He was a member and eucharist minister of St. Catherine's Roman Catholic Church, a charter member of St. Catherine's Knights of Columbus Council 6212 and a member of the Cupsaw Lake Improvement Association. He was also a legislative aide to State Assemblypersons Dean Gallo and Leanna Brown. He will also be long remembered for his compassionate and benevolent efforts on behalf of our Cub Scouts in Cupsaw Lake.

Mr. Speaker, the C. William Hofmann, Jr. Recreation Complex was made possible through a New Jersey State Green Acres grant and a matching local bond. It is surely identified with, and a fitting memorial to, Bill Hofmann who was active in pursuing recreational improvements for the Borough of Ringwood and was instrumental in initiating the Green Acres State grant process and development of the Borough Hall complex as well as other recreational facilities.

The C. William Hofmann, Jr. Recreation Complex consists of the following facilities:

The former little league and major league fields at Borough Field have been upgraded to tournament standards with new lighting and fencing;

Four asphalt tennis courts;

New softball field;

New football-soccer field, with bleachers;

Practice football field, with playing field turf;

Cedar wood jungle gym type playground construction, with playground facilities for the handicapped;

Four wooden checkerboard tables with benches; and

Two boccie ball courts.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much that can be said of Bill Hofmann, his quality leadership, richness of wisdom, and warmth of friendship and with your permission I would like to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress a beautiful endowment of these attributes authored by one of Bill's colleagues, Councilman John J. Brooks, and published by the mayor and council of Ringwood, as follows:

EULOGY TO C. WILLIAM HOFMANN

I always viewed Bill as a simple man; gentle, sensitive and generous of himself to a fault; a man of deep convictions and an extraordinarily highly developed sense of right and wrong grounded in strong religious beliefs. Many people have these qualities, very few have the courage to translate them into the guiding principles of their lives. Bill was one of those few people.

Bill believed that contributing to the betterment of the community was an obligation and that belief coupled with an incredible capacity for hard work, translated into years of dedicated public service. To the school board, the planning board, the environmental commission, the council, as Mayor, to the HUD committee and again to the council—he always gave 110%. Whether it was having fun playing softball or doing the job as Mayor—if it was worth doing, it was worth a total effort.

Bill possessed an inner strength which came through and affected people around him. One intuitively knew that he would be the point of calm in any storm, a person who could be depended on, one who would come to grips with the difficult decision or perform the unpleasant task. Bill was willing to step up to the hard part of the job.

He was not one to casually share his innermost feelings, but when he did, it became quite evident that he believed that his religion and his family were the foundation stones of any success he achieved. His family was the most important element in his life. Bill freely admitted how much he needed Mary and made no effort to hide the love and affection he felt for her and their children.

It is easy to see why Bill was so respected, but respect does not explain the collective sense of loss that came over Ringwood at the news of his death. His dedication and conviction were filtered through a screen of sensitivity and gentleness that caused people to add genuine affection to the respect they felt for him. Bill contributed so much that we should temper our sense of loss with the realization of how poor we would be if he had never been here at all.

I think that those who knew Bill well will not object if I quote from someone far more eloquent than I:

"His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world, 'This was a man'."—Councilman John J. Brooks.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me now in silent prayer to the memory of an outstanding community leader and great American, the Honorable C. William Hofmann, Jr., whose record of exemplary public service which is now memorialized in the C. William Hofmann, Jr. Recreation Complex of Ringwood, N.J., has truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. May his wife Mary and family soon find abiding comfort in the faith that God has given them and in the knowledge that their beloved, C. William Hofmann, Jr., is now under His eternal care. May he rest in peace.●

THE FURTHER DETERIORATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE WAGES AND WORKING CONDITIONS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed the conference report for H.R. 2077, legislation providing temporary retirement contribution adjustments for civil service employees. I am pleased that both the House and Senate took action regarding this serious matter. However, during the past 2 years, Federal employees have been one of the primary scapegoats for the U.S. financial difficulties. We must continue to make reparations for the deterioration of Federal employee wages and working conditions.

Federal employees' salaries are not keeping pace with those in private employment, and their health and retirement benefits are being systematically reduced. In time, the public will suffer due to the continued deterioration of the conditions of employment of the Federal worker. Qualified individuals will no longer work for the Government when they could be more financially secure working in the private sector. I think that perhaps some individuals still believe that the typical Federal employee fits into an old stereotype which depicted Federal employees as shiftless, dull, and disinterested workers. This is hardly the case today.

However, the Reagan administration apparently still perceives Federal employees according to this stereotype. The administration has made policy decisions that have a negative impact on the financial well-being of Federal employees, justifying its policies with the old canard that Federal workers are overpaid, underworked, and given too many benefits. The administration seeks to reduce the Federal Government's budget and scope by slashing away at Federal workers. The most recent example is the White House proposal to downgrade 40,000 jobs in the GS-11 through GS-14 range over the next 4 years through attrition. Consolidation, improved organization, and a smaller Federal Government role have not resulted from the administration's civil service policies. The administration has alienated the Federal worker, severely damaged morale, and made difficult the consistent implementation of Federal law.

Comprehension of the problem begins upon consideration of the fact that Federal employees will probably get a mere 4 percent pay adjustment in January of next year. This increase, which appeared in the reconciliation bill, was delayed from the regular October pay increase date in the hope that some additional money could be saved. I voted against this delay. It is important to note that $8.4 billion of the $10.3 billion that was saved in the reconciliation bill came directly from civil service. Even the current pay raise appears more as an insult than a meaningful increase when compared to the inflation rate. How can a Federal employee expect to improve his living situation when his salary adjustment consistently lags behind the rise in inflation?

The notion that Federal workers are compensated far better than the private sector worker is dispelled by the facts: according to every estimate, the average Federal worker's current compensation—taking pay, retirement and health benefits together—is 20 percent below that of a comparable private worker. A 4-percent pay increase will not close the financial gap between private and Federal employees. Rather, it will continue to make private sector employment more attractive than Federal employment to the most capable people.

Even though Federal pay has traditionally lagged behind private sector pay, some have been attracted to civil service because of the civil service retirement system. Yet even this incentive has been reduced. The Reagan administration proposed drastic cuts in retirement benefits for Federal emplyees for the 1984 budget, including plans to cancel the 1984 cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for retirees under the age of 62; increase employees' contribution from the current 7 to 9 percent in 1984, and 11 percent in 1985; and raise the retirement age for full benefits from 55 to 65. Although the House rejected the administration's proposals, this clearly demonstrates the executive branch's attitude toward Federal employees. Additionally, Federal employees now pay 1.3 pecent of their salaries to medicare.

I voted against the social security bill both times it came to the House floor, in large part because Federal workers were being brought in without a clear guarantee that their current retirement benefits would be protected. This law requires that as of January 1984 new Federal employees must contribute to the social security program, forcing new Federal employees to pay into two retirement programs, the civil service retirement program and social security. This dual payment, accounting for about 14 percent of employees' income, provides additional discouragement to those individuals considering Federal Government employment opportunities. Realizing the significance of this dual contribution, the House and Senate recently agreed to conference reports for H.R. 2077, a bill that provides a 2-year transition period where newly hired Federal employees will pay the full social security tax, but only contribute 1.3 percent to the civil service retirement program. The legislation now awaits President Reagan's approval. Our colleagues from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee have contracted with an actuarial service to analyze additional solutions beyond the 2-year transition period. They will report on the issue early next year. I commend my colleagues for their active role in resolving this dilemma.

Federal workers' health benefits have suffered a similar fate. In the past 2 years, health care costs have risen 56 percent as benefits have been cut an average of 12 percent. The Office of Management and Budget reported on September 20, 1983, in the Washington Post that premiums for Federal workers' health insurance programs will go up 18 percent to 25 percent in January. In addition to higher premiums, some health programs will increase deductibles for treatment of mental and nervous disorders. In response, I cosponsored H.R. 656, the Federal Employee Health Benefits Reform Act of 1983. This legislation would improve Federal employees' health coverage. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee's Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits has held hearings throughout the year, but the bill is still pending in the subcommittee.

I support civil service workers and retirees because I believe that the capabilities and overall quality of Federal employees, as well as morale, will decline if the trends continue. An individual who considers working for the Federal Government will realize that private sector employment will mean a higher salary, and probably smaller employee contributions for health and retirement benefits. In time, the Federal employee will simply not be as efficient as he or she once was. Employees will not possess the capabilities to implement law according to today's standards. In the long run, the public will pay the price for budget cuts in this area.

I cannot overemphasize the gravity of this matter. In President Reagan's October 27, 1983, speech regarding the Lebanon and Grenada military situations, he stated that he fully supports the U.S. military. I, too, support our military personnel. But in order to maintain an efficient, well-run Government, the President must also demonstrate his appreciation for the civil service. I suspect that the President is aware of the present civil service situation. If qualified individuals do not remain in Government, Federal laws will not be implemented as effectively or efficiently. I urge President Reagan to support and encourage improved compensation and benefits for Federal workers and retirees. The administration's failure to recognize the needs of this group today will prove costly to the Nation in the future.●

CONGRATULATING VINCENT ARLOTTA

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite my colleagues to join with me in congratulating Mr. Vincent Arlotta on his retirement as executive director of the Queens Chapter of the American Red Cross.

Together with his wife, Josephine, Vinny Arlotta has been a concerned community activist for almost half a century. He has always been uniquely involved in civic affairs, and has demonstrated an acute commitment to the quality of life in Queens County and New York City. I have admired Vincent Arlotta's unusual stamina as he took a leading role in projects that affect every member of our community. As a 20-year veteran of the New York City Police Department's Mounted Division, Vinny demonstrated his dedication to the safety of the streets of the Big Apple. In addition, he has shown his devotion to the health and welfare of his city by serving for the past 26 years as an active member of the American Red Cross. There, Vince has been supervisor of the Bronx Service Center, and manager of the North Shore and the Central Queens Chapters of the American Red Cross, before he culminated his career as executive director of the Queens Chapter.

Vincent Arlotta's devotion to the youth of our community is exemplified by his commitment to programs serving the future leaders of this country. He has been a board member of the Flushing Boys' Club, and a member of the advisory council of the Queens Borough Public Library. In addition, Vinny has been active in organizations that improve the quality of life of our senior citizens. He has served as a board member of the Jamaica Services Program for Older Adults, vice chairman of the Southeast Queens Consortium of Aging Services, board member and financial secretary of the Queens Council for Social Welfare, and member of the Queens Interagency Council on Aging. He has also remained active in the Kiwanis Club as a past distinguished president and secretary.

Mr. Speaker, Vincent Arlotta is a fine example of an individual who makes his community a strong, healthy and safe place in which to live, work, and play. Vinny is an asset to the people of Queens as a leader of outstanding character whose praiseworthy contributions serve as an inspiration to all of us. I ask that the Members of the House of Representatives join me in congratulating Vincent Arlotta for his years of dedicated service to his community, and in extending to him our very best wishes on his retirement.●

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FULL EMPLOYMENT AND BALANCED GROWTH ACT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago last month, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act was signed into law. With its enactment, our Nation made a commitment to conduct a coordinated economic policy designed to achieve full employment and balanced growth. Unfortunately, our actions to date reveal a dismal record of accomplishments. Indeed, we are now further away from the worthy goal of full employment and balanced growth than ever before in our post depression history. If our Nation is to succeed in an increasingly competitive world economy, we must recommit ourselves to reaching the goal of full employment and balanced growth.

Then, as now, the Full Employment Act offers fulfillment of the promise of opportunity symbolized by our Nation. It expresses our deep commitment to economic progress and social justice, and unequivocally identifies full employment and a productive, expanding economy as the bedrock to the achievement of these goals. It suggests that only by putting to work all Americans who are able, willing, and searching for jobs, can we possibly fulfill our domestic priorities in education, health, housing, urban renewal, the elimination of poverty, and a host of other concerns of our Nation.

The Full Employment Act, however, is much more than a philosophical treatise. It establishes goals and a timetable for the reduction of unemployment and inflation, and it specifically outlines a package of monetary and fiscal policy alternatives, national priority programs, and structural economic programs designed to aid the President and the Congress in moving our economy closer to full, low inflationary, production.

Specifically, the act established interim goals of 4-percent unemployment and 3-percent inflation. It outlines countercyclical employment policies to combat sharp fluctuations in the health of the economy; establishes policies to cope with immorally high rates of youth unemployment and regional and structural unemployment in economically depressed areas; and it establishes policies designed to insure coordination of government activity at all levels with private sector economic activity.

The most important feature of the law, however, concerns the use of monetary and fiscal policy tools. The act requires that these tools be used to simultaneously bring the economy to full employment and a low rate of inflation. In the event that it is impossible to achieve both goals, reducing unemployment is to be viewed as the top priority of monetary and fiscal policy.

In addition, monetary policy is at all times to be consistent with achieving the specific goals outlined by the act. Federal Reserve Board policy objectives are to consider past and prospective developments in employment, unemployment, production, investment, real income, productivity, international trade and payments, and prices. By coordinating these two aspects of economic policy, our economy would best be able to provide employment opportunities for the largest number of Americans in the most resource efficient manner.

Had the economic policy approach outlined by the Full Employment Act been implemented, the past 3 years of misery experienced by millions of American citizens could have been avoided. Unfortunately, the Reagan administration made no effort to formulate economic policies that were consistent with the goals and objectives of the Full Employment Act. The monetary and fiscal policy mix employed by this administration has thrown our economy into the worst recession since the Great Depression. Its priorities are sufficiently skewed that tax breaks go to the rich, while essential welfare and emergency assistance programs are slashed beyond recognition. Home ownership has become virtually impossible for middle-income families in the face of high interest rates, and health care is rapidly becoming unaffordable to the bulk of our society. Beyond a shadow of a doubt, poverty, hunger, crime, and a host of other social problems have become increasingly prominent features of American life since this administration took office. Reaganomics represents a clear and determined step away from the goal of full employment and balanced growth. The lives of millions of Americans, and the future of our Nation, is in jeopardy as a result of these misguided policies.

For our country to remain competitive in an increasingly intertwined world economy, for us to reduce inflation, budget deficits and most importantly, immorally high rates of unemployment, we must implement the coordinated monetary and fiscal policy approach outlined by the Full Employment Act.

Expansionary monetary and fiscal policy must be utilized to promote growth and full employment. In lieu of reductions in Government funded public investment projects, we should be increasing spending in order to stimulate aggregate demand as required by the Full Employment Act. Futhermore, monetary policy should be geared to assist in this general economic expansion, unlike the recession causing monetary policies implemented over the past 3 years. Rather than restricting the growth of the money supply, which drives up interest rates and chokes off private investment, monetary controls should be relaxed so that interest rates will fall. The resulting increase in private sector investment would provide jobs for millions of our currently unemployed, and help lift us from our current depressed economic state.

Opponents of the Full Employment Act argue that inflation will reignite and budget deficits will grow enormously if expansionary economic policies are used. However, current underutilization in the labor and capital markets renders inflation highly unlikely during the recovery stage. While fiscal spending may increase the deficit in the short run, the long-run benefits of an economy producing at full capacity far outweigh this temporary cost. Our Nation stands to gain as much as $250 billion more a year in total output it we are at full production. Budget deficits would be easily erased if the Full Employment Act was implemented.

While much of the full employment debate concerns specific policies and programs, the underlying philosophy of a nation offering prosperity and opportunity to its citizens has been an idea warmly embraced by every generation of Americans. The policies and programs instituted by the Reagan administration have, in effect, been inconsistent with this basic tenet of American society. By implementing the provisions of the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, we can insure that this belief will become a reality. Although its first 5 years of existence have been characterized by disgraceful violation and neglect, the act is the solution to our economic woes that is the most viable, the most equitable, and the most consistent with the founding principles of our great Nation. As an American citizen who has pledged his life to upholding the very fabric of our great Nation, I will fight vigorously to see that noble dream of all Americans become a reality. However, only with the help of my fellow Members of Congress, the President, and most importantly, the citizens of this Nation, can victory be achieved.●

THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1983

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the International Telecommunications Act of 1983, a bill to promote full and effective competition in international telecommunications, and to assure that American industries can compete on an equal footing with their foreign counterparts.

Congress created the Communications Satellite Corp., Comsat, two decades ago to meet national and world needs at a time when we were just entering the space age. Today, with the information age in full swing, we cannot afford to find our Nation's high tech industries struggling to cope with an outdated structure while facing stiff competition from abroad.

This bill addresses three major problems:

First, Comsat—private entity—currently represents the United States before the international satellite organizations, Intelsat and Inmarsat. As our representative at these organizations, Comsat has advance access to crucial information relating to Earth station standards and satellite designs.

In other nations, a government controlled entity represents the country at Intelsat and Inmarsat. In many cases, they turn over the documents they receive to their manufacturers. As a result, only Comsat in the United States has the timely access to these important documents, while in foreign countries, numerous manufacturers have these lead time advantages in the development of equipment used in the provision of international communications services. American industries are left behind, and American jobs are lost to foreign shores.

Second, as AT&T did prior to its divestiture, Comsat is engaged in both monopoly and competitive activities. This corporate structure creates the potential for cross-subsidization that unfairly increases costs to telecommunications users and to the American public at large. In addition, these cross subsidies place the industry at an unfair disadvantage in competition with Comsat's subsidiaries.

Third, there is presently no method to assure that Comsat complies with the instructions of our Government when it represents the United States at Intelsat or Inmarsat. Indeed, we allow this company, with its own agenda that may or may not be the same as the public interest, to be our official spokesman with no effective supervision.

The International Telecommunications Act offers answers to all three of these problems.

It requires timely public disclosure of the documents Comsat receives in connection with its Intelsat/Inmarsat activities. This should put American firms back in a fair competitive position with respect to foreign manufacturers.

It requires the divestiture of Comsat's competitive ventures, returning the corporation to the original activities that Congress envisioned for it. This would also eliminate the possibility of unfair and anticompetitive cross-subsidization of monopoly and competitive endeavors.

It authorizes the President to appoint a representative to Comsat's delegations to Intelsat and Inmarsat in an effort to monitor the corporation's compliance with our Government's instructions. This provision should help insure that the policies which are pursued in our name really represent the best interests of our country, and not just the interests of one company within our country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and in moving it to full consideration as soon as possible.

A factsheet and section-by-section analysis follow for inclusion.

FACTSHEET ON THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1983

DISCLOSURE OF INTELSAT/INMARSAT DOCUMENTS

Requires Comsat to place in a public file on a timely basis all Intelsat/Inmarsat documents circulated to Intelsat/Inmarsat signatories.

This allows U.S. high tech firms to have the same prompt access to important technical information that their foreign competitors receive from their Intelsat/Inmarsat representatives, eliminating foreign lead time advantages.

Exempts those documents which contain Intelsat/Inmarsat personal information about Intelsat/Inmarsat participants or other inappropriate information.

COMSAT DIVESTITUTE

Requires divestiture of Comsat competitive activities within 18 months of enactment. Restricts Comsat to (1) investing in Intelsat/Inmarsat (2) representing U.S. before Intelsat/Inmarsat (3) furnishing Intelsat/Inmarsat services as a common carrier (4) related activities.

Allows Comsat to propose a plan for this divestiture to be approved by the F.C.C.

Effectively prevents cross-subsidization between competitive and monopoly activities by separating those activities.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS

Mandates that the instructions of the F.C.C. and the President bind Comsat in all policy questions before Intelsat/Inmarsat. In the event of conflict, Presidential instructions take precedence.

President may appoint a representative to Comsat delegations to Intelsat/Inmarsat to insure that these instructions are obeyed.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Classification of Carriers: Gives the F.C.C. the authority and the guidelines for designating international telecommunications carriers as "dominant carriers."

Forbear From Regulation: Allows F.C.C., after transitional period, to forbear from regulation non-dominant international carriers under the market power test.

Interconnection: Requires fair access to interconnection to international carriers for all telecommunications carriers.

Penalties: Prescribes penalties for violations of the Act.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1983

Section 1. Title.

Section 2. Statement of Findings: It is in the public interest to foster full and effective competition in international telecommunications markets and to assure that American corporations can compete on an equal footing with their foreign counterparts. Comsat however, can use its monopoly position at Intelsat and Inmarsat to gain unfair advantages in competitive markets. Furthermore, although other countries disclose Intelsat and Inmarsat documents to their manufacturers, American industries are at a serious disadvantage because they do not have access to that information.

Section 3. Purpose: The purpose of the bill is to promote full and fair competition in international telecommunications markets and to assure that American corporations are not disadvantaged in competition abroad.

Section 601. Definitions: The bill defines certain specialized terms. International telecommunications includes transmissions between any place in the U.S. and a foreign country. Dominant international carriers are carriers that are found by the FCC to have market power based on criteria specified in the bill. Essential facility means a telecommunications facility owned or controlled by a single carrier or a group of carriers, the use of which is essential to competing carriers in the provision of a telecommunications service.

Section 602. Statement of Policy: It is the policy of the U.S. (1) to rely whenever possible on marketplace competition and the private sector to provide international telecommunications services, to reduce unnecessary regulation and to encourage entry by new carriers into the international telecommunications marketplace; (2) to consider the interests of other nations in implementing its own policy with regard to international telecommunications services; and (3) to promote the interconnection of international telecommunications facilities based upon the cost of providing such facilities.

Section 603. Authority of the FCC: The FCC shall revise, reduce or eliminate any rule or regulation and exempt any carrier from the requirements of the Act as competition develops unless such revision, reduction or elimination may result in a significant and adverse impact on national security or on the economic competitiveness and viability of United carriers. The FCC shall have continuing authority over the provision of international telecommunications services by dominant international carriers.

Section 604. Regulation of Dominant Carriers: The bill provides for the continuing regulation of dominant carriers and authorizes the FCC to classify or reclassify as a dominant international carrier any international telecommunications carrier that has market power. The bill specifies five factors that the FCC must consider in determining whether a carrier has market power.

Section 605. Transitional Provisions: The bill requires the FCC to deregulate non-dominant carriers and provides transitional mechanisms. International telecommunications carriers that provide service under tariff will be continued to be regulated for a period of six months. Within six months, the FCC must hold hearings to determine which of the international telecommunications carriers are dominant and must continue to be regulated. The FCC must revise at least once every two years any determination that an international telecommunications carrier is dominant. If it finds that a carrier is non-dominant, the FCC must deregulate it.

Section 606. Interconnection: The bill requires any carrier providing regulated international telecommunications service to interconnect with any carrier, facility equipment or private system upon reasonable request and pursuant to nondiscriminatory terms and conditions. Charges, terms or conditions for interconnection must be based on the cost of such services or facilities provided for interconnection.

Subsection (b) requires the FCC to treat any carrier that provides both international and domestic services as a separate domestic telecommunications carrier and a separate international telecommunications carrier for purpose of the interconnection requirements. Such carriers must not unjustly discriminate against any other carrier with respect to interconnection terms and conditions.

Subsection (c) subjects any carrier that refuses to provide equal interconnection on a reasonable request to a fine of up to $250,000.

Section 201. Communications Satellite Act of 1962: The bill revises the instructional process, requires Comsat to disclose Intelsat and Inmarsat documents, and requires Comsat to divest its affiliates that engage in competitive activities. The bill amends sections 201 and 504 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, as amended, and it adds new sections 758 and 759.

The bill authorizes the President to issue instructions to Comsat on the positions to take at Intelsat. It also provides that any instructions that he issues either with regard to Intelsat or Inmarsat must be made public. In addition, the legislation authorizes the President to appoint a Government representative to participate in all of Comsat's activities with respect to both Intelsat and Inmarsat.

As for the FCC, the bill requires the agency to provide public notice of the agendas of Intelsat and Inmarsat meetings and a reasonable opportunity for public comment and reply comment. It also authorizes the FCC to make recommendations to the President in order to assist him in his issuance of instructions to Comsat and requires that any such recommendations be made public.

With respect to matters within its regulatory jurisdiction, the FCC may itself issue instructions to Comsat but any such instructions must also be made public. In the event that there is a conflict in the instructions issued by the FCC and the President, the President's shall prevail. The bill specifically provides that instructions issued by the President and those issued by the FCC which do not conflict with the President's shall be binding.

With regard to document disclosure, the bill states that the FCC must require Comsat to place all Intelsat and Inmarsat documents which are circulated to the foreign signatories in a public file. The only documents that are exempt from that requirement are those which contain personal information about Intelsat or Inmarsat participants and contractor evaluation reports.

The bill also adds two new sections to the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. Section 758 requires Comsat to divest all of its affiliates that engage in competitive activities. Under this section Comsat must submit a plan for divestiture to the FCC within 180 days. The FCC then has 60 days to either approve or disapprove the plan. If the FCC disapproves the plan, Comsat may file an amended plan. However, if Comsat fails to file an amended plan within 30 days of the issuance of the FCC's order, the FCC must prescribe a plan.

Following divestiture, Comsat will be limited to the following activities: (1) investing in Intelsat and Inmarsat; (2) representing the United States on the Intelsat Board of Governors and the Inmarsat Council; (3) furnishing Intelsat services as a common carrier to authorized carriers; (4) furnishing Inmarsat services as a participating carrier; and (5) researching and developing new technologies for the Intelsat and Inmarsat satellite systems.

Section 759 imposes penalties in the event that Comsat fails to comply with the instructions issued by the FCC or the President. It also provides penalties for failure to comply with the divestiture requirement. Failure to comply with the instructions on the positions to take at Intelsat or Inmarsat is subject to a civil penalty of up to $250,000. Violations of the divestiture requirement are also subject to a civil penalty of up to $250,000. In the case of a violation of the divestiture requirement however, a separate penalty must be imposed for each day on which the offense occurs.●

ARGENTINA AND NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the Export Administration Act, the House passed an amendment I offered which prohibited the export or retransfer of any U.S.-origin nuclear technology to nations that have not accepted internationally recognized "full-scope safeguards" on all their nuclear facilities.

One of the recent administration actions which illustrated the pressing need for restrictions of this kind was the decision to approve the retransfer of 143 tones of U.S.-origin heavy water to Argentina. The Argentine sale was approved even though that country has not disavowed an interest in nuclear weapons and is widely suspected of seeking nuclear capability.

To fully portray the potential nuclear proliferation risk that Argentina represents, I want to commend to my colleagues the following article by Paul Buchanan, a research fellow with the Washington-based Council on Hemispheric Affairs. I believe the article adds further credence to the argument that the United States can and should cut off nuclear trade with Argentina and the handful of other nations that have not renounced nuclear arms; to do so is essential to our own national security and to the cause of world peace.

The article follows:

ARGENTINA MOVES TOWARD THE BOMB WITH AN ASSIST FROM WASHINGTON

The administration's recent decision to permit the sale of U.S.-produced, but West German-owned, heavy water to Argentina is very likely to bring grave global consequences. If, as some White House advisers have argued privately, this move primarily was intended to create U.S. leverage over the Argentina military, so that it will be less likely to interfere in the restoration of civilian rule in the coming weeks, then the Reagan administration displays a remarkable ignorance of the realities present in that troubled South American nation.

Although the heavy water sale is formally destined for use in commercial reactors under international safeguards, much of Argentina's nuclear program (including a reprocessing plant that is said to have already produced 200kg of plutonium) remains outside international scrutiny. More importantly, even the commercial reactors are under outright military control, which allows the armed forces the opportunity to interfere and screen out many safeguard requirements.

Moreover, Argentina has steadfastly maintained its right to "peaceful" nuclear explosives, and has not ratified either the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) or the Treaty of Tlatelolco (which created a nuclear-freeze zone in Latin America). In the wake of its Falklands defeat, there are persistent reports from both Argentine and U.S. sources that the military has set itself the goal of having an operational nuclear weapons program within two years. It could then use nuclear capability as a shield under which another attempt might be made to alter the Falkland Islands status quo through diplomacy or force.

Before the war, Argentina was a nuclear threshold state with a diplomatic stance and technological capability to aggressively press an expansionist strategic doctrine that included a pro-nuclear weapons policy. Aside from refusing to ratify Tlatelolco and the NPT, Argentina is also not a signatory of the Seabed Arms Control Agreements or the Bilogical Weapons Convention. But it is the drive to become an autonomous nuclear power which has become the centerpiece of the country's strategic doctrine.

From its creation in 1950, the Argentine National Atomic Energy Commission (CNEA) has been under the exclusive control of the Navy, perhaps the most bellicose of the nation's military services. While insulating the nuclear program from the country's chronic political turmoil, military control has also removed it from civilian scrutiny. Thus, it should come as no surprise that Vice Admiral Carlos Castro Madero, an active duty officer, is only the third person (all naval officers) to hold the director's post at CNEA, a remarkable feat of longevity in Argentina's merry-go-round political scene. National elections held in October are therefore unlikely to seriously alter the character or orientation of Argentine nuclear policy.

Irrespective of upcoming political developments, the nuclear program will remain under Navy control, and military requirements and perceptions will thus continue to dominate nuclear policymaking. In the wake of the Falklands, with all of its damaging impact on the prestige of the armed forces, there is little doubt that a new emphasis has been placed on the quest for a nuclear weapons capability.

Argentina's nuclear program has always been the most advanced in Latin America, and today the country is virtually self-sufficient in nuclear physics, technology, and fuel. This includes two operational commercial reactors generating a projected total of 960 Mw (Atucha II), two reprocessing laboratories, an enrichment plant, several research reactors, and ample domestic uranium reserves.

The secrecy surrounding some of the facilities—particularly the research reactors—is impressive. There have even been reports of civilian scientists being held against their will in facilities near Bariloche, hundreds of miles from Buenos Aires, in order to ensure their silence and cooperation with the project.

The Argentines, although not ratifying the NPT, have accepted International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA) safeguards, which ostensibly include on-site inspection for all of their research and power reactors. However, they steadfastly refuse to accept "full scope" safeguards that govern nuclear items produced domestically. This includes spent fuel, from which weapons grade plutonium is derived. Thus, although IAEA safeguards govern international transfers of plutonium and other nuclear materials, the Argentine government is not bound by them. It has also been less than candid about operations in several of its plants, particularly its reprocessing laboratory and uranium mining and conversion facilities. In defending the heavy water sale, State Department officials contended that plutonium could not be routed out of the safeguarded facilities to those without safeguards. The fact is most of the plutonium manufactured in Argentina is produced in the unsafeguarded reprocessing laboratory. Even if it were not, the State Department's contention rests on the assumption that the Argentine military establishment will demonstrate prudence and restraint, which they have not done to date.

There are additional problems with Washington's argument that it is safe to provide heavy water to the Argentine government because its commercial reactors are safeguarded. Many experts contend that IAEA safeguards on heavy water technology need updating, in order to keep pace with innovations in the field. If this is true, it remains an open question whether the Atucha II reactor is under adequate safeguards despite Sate Department assertions to the contrary. In any event, it is clear that monitoring the Argentine nuclear program is difficult at best, particularly since it is oriented towards achieving self-sufficiency that also will free it from most international safeguard mechanisms.

Whatever the rationale for doing so, Argentina's increasingly clear decision to "go nuclear" in a weapons sense is sure to create consternation in the area and elsewhere. Regional rivals, especially Brazil and Chile, certainly will feel obliged to keep pace, and other nations with similar problems outside of Latin America may feel encouraged to follow the same course of action. Only prompt negotiations by the British over the future of the Falklands with a successor civilian Argentine government will prevent that country from developing its nuclear threat. But in light of the resounding Thatcher victory in the June elections, such an outcome appears unlikely to happen in the near future, thereby opening the way for Argentina's entry into the nuclear weapons club.

The Reagan administration's rush decision to authorize the sale of heavy water to Argentina served not only to sanction the role of West Germany as a major supplier of weaponry and other controversial exports to several Latin American dictatorships, but also to fuel an already volatile domestic situation in Argentina. In bypassing the Nuclear Regulatory Agency, the White House revealed an unbecoming sense of haste in an extremely sensitive area.

If anything, approval should have been put off several months—until the democratically-elected civilian government had come into power in Argentina. It also should be contingent on Argentine ratification of nonproliferation agreements and acceptance of international safeguards over its entire nuclear program. Since incoming Radical President Raul Alfonsin was elected on a platform that included a strong anti-militarist stance, it is likely that he would be more willing to renounce the nuclear weapons option once in office.

Until such a time, however, any nuclear component sale to Argentina is another step toward nuclear weapons status. It already has the plutonium weapons option thanks to the stockpile of plutonium produced at the safeguarded reprocessing plant. The sale of heavy water now provides them with an essential ingredient for the enriched uranium route, as an offshot of commercial power production, by diverting the by-products of the commercial reactors to the nuclear weapons program. Based on reliable calculations, it can thus be argued that the heavy water sale is a decisive move toward doubling the nuclear weapons potential of Argentina. The implications are ominous. Only public outcry and Congressional opposition can prevent completion of the sale until a time when Argentina is more favorably disposed toward nuclear restraint.●

SITUATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. BALTASAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, the importance of a negotiated, peaceful settlement in Central America again needs to be underscored. The countries of the region continue to be the victims of disarray and violence at the expense of their economic and political development. The toll in terms of human lives, particularly in Nicaragua and El Salvador, continues to be high and the prospects for a prompt resolution are dim.

The United States has clear and well-defined interests to protect in Central America. Not only are they our neighbors and their political integrity and security are of importance to us but we also share common interest and aspirations for the welfare of our respective citizens. We must spare no efforts in order to bring about peace to that region.

Before lasting peace can be achieved, however, we must always keep in mind two things: First, there are legitimate concerns of the people in the region in their search for political and human dignity. The people will not stand idly by and tolerate a perpetuation of a system that does not recognize their basic rights to liberty and a chance to educate their children and improve their opportunities for a better life. For too long, the people of Central America have struggled against the oppression and injustice that have prevented them from exercising their full rights and responsibilities as members of the society. It is the basic lack of equality that provides fertile ground for exploitation by the Cubans and the Soviets. We must insure that these basic concerns are addressed and resolved to prevent this exploitation.

A second issue to be kept in mind is the fact that the United States cannot act alone. We must join forces with other governments in the region in order to reach a lasting settlement that will bring about the peace we all desire. In that regard, the efforts of the Contadora group—Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Panama—should become the basis of negotiations. For almost a year, the governments of those countries have been relentless in meetings and talks to define the issues and to offer solutions that will uphold and further the democratic principles they espouse.

At their most recent meeting in September, the Foreign Ministers of the Contadora group, together with the Foreign Ministers of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, agreed on the following objectives:

1. To promote détente in the area while avoiding any action that jeopardizes the political trust needed for an effective, peaceful dialog.

2. To put an end to conflicts by making a political commitment to the achievement of regional peace and stability by avoiding any action that might hinder these objectives.

3. To resolve controversies by peaceful means on the basis of mechanisms commonly agreed on.

4. To curb the arms race in all its forms and to initiate negotiations on the control and reduction of the current arms inventory and the number of armed troops.

6. To ban in their territories the presence of foreign forces, facilities, or military bases.

7. To reach agreements in order to reduce, with an eye to eliminating, the presence of foreign military or other advisers who might be used for military and security purposes.

8. To eliminate the arms traffic for persons, groups, or organizations trying to destabilize the Governments of Central America, and to establish control mechanisms for this purpose.

9. To prevent the use of their territories and to abstain from either lending or permitting either military or logistical support to those individuals, groups, or organizations trying to destabilize Central American governments.

10. To organize mixed security commissions and coordinate direct communications systems to prevent and, if needed, resolve incidents between bordering and nonbordering states.

11. To respect and guarantee the exercise of human, political, civilian, economic, social, religious, and cultural rights.

12. To adopt measures guaranteeing the improvement of popular consultation methods and the peopls's effective participation in the decision-making process as regards the political conduct of the states; also, to guarantee the free access of the various political currents to the electoral processes.

13. To promote national reconciliation actions in those cases where profound divisions have taken place within society by establishing representative and pluralistic systems.

14. To foster suitable conditions for the voluntary repatriation of Central American refugees or, if such were the case, to offer the necessary facilities for their integration or relocation under the supervision of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refuges or other similar international organizations.

15. To endorse actions undertaken to obtain material aid for Central American refugees.

16. To set in motion economic and social development programs to achieve greater welfare and an equitable distribution of wealth.

17. To revitalize and normalize economic integration mechanisms to achieve sustained development based on solidarity and mutual benefit.

18. To make joint efforts to obtain foreign monetary resources to insure additional resources with which to finance the reactivation of intraregional trade, to overcome the serious balance of payment problems, to attract funds for working capital, to endorse programs for expanding and restructuring productive systems, and to foment medium and long-term investment plans.

19. To make joint efforts to obtain better and broader access to international markets in order to expand the trade flow between Central American countries and the rest of the world, especially the industrialized countries, through a revision of the commercial practices, the elimination of tariff and nontariff barriers, and the guarantee of profitable and just prices for regional exports.

20. To make joint efforts toward obtaining technical cooperation mechanisms for the planning, programming, and execution of varied plans for commercial investment and promotion.

21. To begin immediate negotiations to conclude the treaties and other international documents needed to formalize the commitments included in this document and to guarantee the establishment of suitable systems for control and verification.

These principles, which have become known as the Twenty One Points, deserve the strong endorsement and support of the U.S. Government and the rest of the world community. Negotiations should lead to free elections that will relfect the wishes of the people and will further their human rights.

The people of Puerto Rico share with the nations of Central America a common language, culture, and many traditions. We also share in the suffering of its citizens and it is my hope that the efforts of the Contadora group will prove fruitful and will result in peace and prosperity for all the countries of Central America.●

STEVEN B. LA RIVIERE, SERGEANT, USMC

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on November 12 the people of Chicopee, Mass., bade farewell to one of their own, Sgt. Steven Breck La Riviere, USMC.

Sergeant La Riviere lost his life, with 238 of his comrades, in the terrorist bombing of the marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, on October 23. He had been assigned to the reconnaissance detachment of the battalion landing team that was headquartered in the building destroyed in that terrible and senseless act of violence. Steven had been scheduled to leave Lebanon on November 11.

Steven La Riviere was an exceptional young man. An accomplished athlete and avid photographer, he volunteered for the Marine Corps after his graduation from Chicopee High School in 1980. His decision to join the Marines was, like so many others in his life, a product of his desire to be of service to others. He was attracted to the Marine Corps because the spirit of that organization so closely matched his own. He was proud to be a marine and the Marine Corps and his country, are proud of and grateful to him.

The bombing in Beirut has deeply touched our Nation. As we mourn the deaths of so many of our finest men, we share in the grief being experienced by each of their families. I hope that Steven's parents, Richard and Janet La Riviere, his four brothers, Keith, Robert, Michael, and John, and his five sisters, Cheryl, Linda, Joanne, Nancy Jean, and Lesley Anne, can take some comfort in the fact that we have all been diminished by the loss they have suffered. Steven represented what is good about America: its sense of optimism and exuberance, and its willingness to come to the aid of those in need. The memory of Steven's life will burn brightly in all who knew him and the record of his service, and his sacrifice, will never be forgotten by the country that he loved.

Mr. Speaker, the most Reverend Joseph F. Maguire, bishop of the Catholic diocese of western Massachusetts, delivered a beautiful eulogy at St. George's Church in Chicopee last Saturday. I would like to include Bishop Maguire's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

FUNERAL MASS FOR STEVEN LA RIVIERE, ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH—CHICOPEE

November is a time for memories—So often memories that are somber, soul-stirring and sad. It was twenty years ago, on a gray November day, that a young, exciting and promising President was shot to death in Dallas.

It is every November 11—on Veterans Day—that the clarion call of taps resounds all over this valley—reminding us of those who have given their last full measure of devotion—in the cause of freedom—and for the preservation of liberty. Today, we are stunned once again by the suddenness of this sorrow—A vital, sparkling, bright, intelligent, beloved young man—taken from his family and friends by a futile and senseless act of violence.

Sergeant Steven La Riviere was admired and respected in this parish and in this community. As a Marine, he stood out among his comrades. He was a leader, a man among men, humorous, happy, a gentleman of honor and principle.

What he did for others by way of thoughtfulness and courtesy—was done in a quiet, unpretentious manner. He was not self-seeking, not interested in publicizing his acts of kindness and generosity. In so many ways, he was a man for others.

In a sorrow like this—when the love that has bound this family together—is so cruelly interrupted, when the bonds and ties of affection appear to be broken and torn apart—in our frustration and confusion we can fear that we have nowhere to go—nowhere to turn. But in our calmer and quieter moments, we understand once again that we do have a place to go. There is a way to turn—and that is to the embrace of a loving Father who is the source of all life—the inspiration of all love—the alpha and omega—the beginning and the end of our existence.

The love of Steven La Riviere for his parents—and his brothers and sisters—is fixed and suspended now. It has moved to a higher level of existence. It has changed from a human, an earth-bound love—to a love that is eternal, transforming, unending, overflowing, forever. It is faith in the words of Scripture. "God is love"—that makes it possible for us to look up and lift up our hearts and to be reassured in this conviction. Steven has been welcomed by the God of all love—and his relationship with his parents and sisters and brothers is blessed now with a new kind of intimacy. God is love—and because Steven abides in God—and God in him—his influence will continue to play a wondrous, supernatural and significant role in the lives of all who knew and loved him in the years of his earthly journey.

I thought of Steven—and his fellow Marines—and so many of our courageous young men and women in military service—when I listened to this morning's gospel—"Blessed are the peacemakers—they shall be called Sons of God." What is strong and heroic and courageous and worthy of imitation in young men like Steven La Riviere—is their sense of justice, their appreciation of human dignity, their dedication to the search and the striving for peace. When an act of terrorism abruptly and unjustly ends the lives of innocent and upright young men—the temptation is to strike back—to resort to similar tactics of violence—to demand an eye for an eye—and a tooth for a tooth. But this is not the way to peace—this is the perpetuation of atrocity—and the justification for revenge.

The character of Steven La Riviere—and so many like him—rises above and beyond this kind of behaviour—and challenges us and our leaders in government to continue to walk the high road—to probe every available and reasonable avenue for resolving the differences and disputes that tear people apart—and that make a battleground of a world God meant to be beautiful and serene.

The nobility of Steven La Riviere and the sense of dedication that prompted him to risk and to offer his life as an instrument and a defender of peace—is incentive for us to overcome enmity, to resist the temptation to hurt and to hate—and in moments when we are persecuted and reviled unfairly to pray as Jesus did when he hung helpless and dying on Calvary's Cross—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

What we sense, what we experience on this day is that Steven La Riviere has merited our esteem not only while he has walked among us. In his death, he continues to motivate and move us. It is he who has brought us together this morning; he in recent days who has prompted our expressions of sympathy and our gestures of heartfelt compassion; he whose passing reminds us how fragile and how fleeting is the gift of life—and how appreciative and considerate of one another we should be as we travel life's road together. It is Steven who has brought out the best in us—who has drawn us to his parents and sisters and brothers so that somehow we might share in their sorrow—and lighten and make more bearable the burden of grief so swiftly and unexpectedly thrust upon their shoulders.

Finally, because the torch of virtue and good example has fallen from his hands—it is Steven who speaks to us—who signals and sounds the call to pick up that torch—to carry it faithfully in his name and in his memory. This is his legacy to us—this is our pledge and our gift to him. So long as we cherish and hold fast to the values and ideals that marked his short but sterling span of years—then his goodness will go on and endure and he will not have died in vain.

Dick and Janet La Riviere—your son was proud to be a United States Marine. Though your loss is great—and your sorrow deep—forever you will have this consoling memory. He became what he wanted to be. As we join in the prayer of this eucharistic sacrifice today, we can almost hear Steven echoing the words of Saint Paul: "I have fought the good fight to the end; I have run the race to the finish; I have kept the faith." And because you, his parents, were the first teachers and the root source of your son's faith, hope and love—you are able to say on this day: "The Lord gives and the Lord takes away. Blessed be the name of the Lord."

May he rest in peace. Amen.●

SPEECH BY NOEL C. KOCH

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a speech delivered by Noel C. Koch, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs. Mr. Koch is a distinguished scholar and brings considerable insight into this most complex area of our foreign and military policy. I believe it is a very clear statement of this country's security assistance policy toward Third World nations. My colleagues should know that this speech contains some startling statistics about the size of the Soviet presence in the Third World as compared to U.S. presence as well as the manner in which the Soviet Union uses security assistance in order to control Third World nations.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY NOEL C. KOCH

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you a matter which is frequently the subject of demagoguery from both extremes of the political spectrum, and one which deserves more of the sort of attention which you bring to this occasion.

Let me go first to that failure of understanding which seems centered chiefly in the Congress, and finds its way from there to opinion-makers in the media, and from there to the American public at large.

Each year the Executive Branch goes to the Congress with a foreign assistance budget request. That request is one of the battlegrounds upon which the nation's priorities are thrashed out.

Part of that budget goes to foreign aid, and some of that aid is just that. Out of the pockets of the taxpayer it goes to nations which need and want our help, and it is given freely in the sense that the recipient doesn't have to pay it back.

That part of the total budget comes to about two percent of federal expenditures in any given year, and reflects the singular political fact, often stated in Washington, that "There is no consistency for foreign aid." Providing money, food or technical assistance to a developing country doesn't produce the votes that a clover-leaf or a dam or a defense contract back home produces. I don't say that cynically; it's a simple fact of our democratic process.

There are other mechanisms that provide assistance in one form or other—the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and others are instrumentalities in which we also play a role, though that role is much more convoluted than it is in the assistance we provide directly.

One major component of foreign aid is security assistance. I think it is fair to say that the most benign perception of security assistance is that it goes to help others defend themselves. A less generous and more suspicious view is that it enables its recipients to make war on others—both outside and within their own borders.

Part of this notion has it that beneath this umbrella of security assistance "America, the munitions merchant" goes about arming the world—seeking, by its own lights, to make the world safe for democracy, and succeeding only in making it unsafe for humanity. And doing all this with the taxpayers' dollars—dollars which, by the way, could be far better spent on cloverleafs and dams and housing projects.

There is a programmatic misunderstanding here, to begin with. The next time you hear a Senator or Congressman inveighing against security assistance and how much money it costs, you should know that most of the money involved is off-budget. It goes to recipients not in the form of grant aid, but largely as loans. More than half of the Administration's security assistance request currently before the Congress is on a loan basis. These loans are made at the prevailing interest rate, with a few notable exceptions, and they must be repaid—and, I might note, again with a few notable exceptions, they are repaid.

So, in other words, the term "security assistance" is in large part a misnomer. It is no more assistance than that which the bank provides when it gives you a mortgage. The bank benefits. So do we. Security assistance, far from being a drain on the taxpayer, is a revenue-producer. We charge a three percent surcharge to defray our management costs, and virtually without exception all goods and services are procured from the U.S. This creates jobs throughout the country—in Iowa, in my home state of Pennsylvania and here in Minnesota. This is also true of Foreign Military Cash Sales which are a straight buy, without credit.

There are various kinds of security assistance. The largest is Foreign Military Sales Credits, or FMSCR, which reflect most of the features I have been discussing.

There are also three forms of security assistance that are provided largely or totally as a grant. The first of these is the Economic Support Fund or ESF. In fiscal year 1984 we are requesting almost $3 billion in ESF, about 85 percent of which would be grant. ESF, which is administered by the Agency for International Development, provides balance of payments assistance, project aid or commodity import assistance and other improvements to a country's civilian infrastructure. Although ESF is an important element of the overall security assistance program, I should like to emphasize that ESF funds may not be used to buy military goods and services.

The second of these is International Military Education and Training, or IMET. All IMET is grant aid. This is just what the name implies. We teach military personnel from other countries various skills. Some of this is done abroad, but most of it is done here. Along with the training, it allows us to inculcate certain values of democratic consequence—such as the subordination of the military to the common good of the nation. It also allows us to form friendly personal relationships which often pay off as the student goes home and ascends through the ranks of his own military structure.

And there is the Military Assistance Program, or MAP, which this Administration revived in fiscal year 1982 to assist economically hard-pressed countries meet their debt burdens. Until recently, these funds were used only for spare parts and supplies for major equipment provided in the past, but funds to cover new purchases are once more being appropriated by Congress.

Before moving on, there are two points that need to be made.

The first is that there are constraints on our assistance. There are types of assistance that we do not provide at all. For example, I was approached recently to provide silencers for weapons. We don't do it; we are not allowed to do it. Nor do we provide aid under security assistance for civilian law enforcement entities.

Recipients of materiel under security assistance are not permitted to transfer that materiel—even though, technically, they own it—to third parties without the express permission of the United States Government or to use it for aggressive purposes.

Finally, the Administration does not unilaterally decide the level and contents of country programs. Congress must appropriate all program resources, and must be notified in advance of proposed major weapons systems sales (over $14 million). Congress exerts a strong hand and makes its views known in detail. For example, Congress generally votes more money for Israel and Egypt than the Administration requests, while slashing other programs. Indeed, about half of all our security assistance goes to just those two countries. The remaining will be spread in various forms over almost 100 countries.

But there are larger questions, and I believe these are what most engage your interest.

Should we have a security assistance program at all; does it work, or might it be counter-productive and, if so, what do we do about it?

The temptation always is to try to explain all this in Manichean terms, as a struggle between the forces of light and the forces of dark, with only one, conclusive outcome possible.

It is surprising how difficult it is to step back from what may seem at first glance a compulsion. One says, I'm a reasonable person; I'm talking to reasonable people; the Manichean proposition is not reasonable; therefore. * * *

Therefore, the terms of reference become highly problemmatical, and the resulting argument may tend to become specious.

You either accept or you do not accept the view that the Soviet Union is an expansionist power. You accept or reject the contention that the projection of Soviet power is a threat to Western nations and their shared values and is intended to be. And you acknowledge or you don't that the position of the West is fundamentally reactive and defensive in the face of all this. The alternative is, it seems to me, that we are ourselves an expansionist, aggressive power: in which case, how to explain our lack of success, of territorial aggrandizement, of domination over the societies and economies of other nations.

I know it is considered gauche to call attention to differences of gender in public discourse today, but I think a difference needs to be recognized. Long ago I read my Lysistrata, and more recently I have read enough private campaign polls to know that a constant in the difference between men and women is that women don't like war. Or, at least, of the two sexes, they're the ones least afraid to acknowledge that they don't like it. Close behind them in this attribute are men who have actually engaged in it.

The point being that all this talk about the Soviets being an expansionist power is often met by women with a resounding "So what!" I'm never sure what is the proper response to that. "What" usually seems to me self-evident, and so if it doesn't seem evident to others, the exchange seems to break down.

We do, however, have some fairly contemporary evidence, and some not so contemporary, to suggest that aggression feeds on itself, and that when it's been fed sufficiently it frequently visits itself upon people who thought they could avoid it by ignoring it.

In a nutshell, and expressing the proposition purely in terms of self-interest, if we can thwart the appetite of aggression by providing others the means to defend themselves, rather than by going to war ourselves, then we think that's a pretty good investment.

It seems to me that argument makes sense when we single out countries such as Thailand which faces a threat from Vietnam, which occupied Laos and Kampuchea, in spite of the peace-loving intentions ascribed to Hanoi by some in America in the late 1960's and early 1970's after we'd been led into a war there in the very early 1960's.

Or when we single out El Salvador or Honduras facing a country like Nicaragua, which has far and away the largest military force in all of Latin America, for reasons which remain obscure if we believe Nicaragua has no ambition but to be a peaceful, independent, pluralistic nation.

But the issues become more complicated, and thus more interesting, when we look at a place like Africa.

Here the question of the efficacy of security assistance needs to be carefully considered.

Africa is a continent in turmoil. It has still to emerge from the problems of colonialism, and post-colonialism—which are not the same, and not even always related.

Africa has terrific economic difficulties. Nations which had inched themselves toward that mystical posture which Barbara Ward called "the economic take-off point" were virtually destroyed economically by the Arab oil embargo of 1973, and subsequent oil price increases, and the concomitant collapse of markets for Africa's resources.

It has its full share of Soviet adventurism with which to contend. But, is it fair to single out the Soviets for their activities in Africa and not to consider what the United States is doing? I think it is. I think we have to, because there is a body of thought in the United States which has it that we are striving somehow to make Africa a new cockpit of great power rivalry.

I want to put the alleged "striving" in perspective. As of today, Soviet and Soviet surrogate forces, Cuban and Eastern bloc forces, in Africa total in excess of 40,000 people. These are chiefly combat and combat-advisory forces. At any given time, the number of American military personnel in Sub-Saharan Africa, exclusive of Embassy Marine guards, runs to maybe one hundred fifty, usually less, and these are a fluctuating population composed in part of temporary training teams. One hundred fifty as opposed to 40,000. I might also note that our offices of military cooperation are limited by statute to no more than six people; in all of Sub-Saharan Africa, Congress has so far refused to authorize an exception to that limitation.

In terms of money for what we call security assistance, the numbers look like this: Since the mid-1950's both Soviet agreements to provide equipment and actual deliveries have outstripped the U.S. by a factor of ten. In that period we offered to provide about $750M in equipment and delivered about $500M while the Soviets have promised close to $8B of which they have already delivered almost $6B.

Having said all this, I should tell you that I am not content as I assess the utility of our security assistance programs in a place like Africa.

One always approaches different cultures, different political constraints, with a sense of trepidation. Having traveled to every continent except Antarctica, one has a sense of being part of a minority—and a small minority, at that—which cherishes values that, having evolved over centuries, and having been fought and died for, and having produced wealth and choice and liberty, seem preferred almost by nature in a kind of natural political selection. And yet, we are a minority for all that. Which leads one to ponder this question of preference.

If we're right, why don't others acknowledge it by adopting our conventions? I don't know; I only know they mostly do not.

So we see nations which apparently choose to maintain themselves outside the communist orbit, yet not within our own. And we fall into a cultural, political and economic crack between communism and the free world. Here we have a dilemma.

The primary purpose of security assistance is to help friendly governments challenged by external threats. Frequently, however, internal pressures stemming from domestic tensions—ethnic, religious, regional, racial—also threaten these governments. And these internal problems are not helped by purchasing expensive weapons or otherwise burdening fragile economies with defense expenditures. Such situations are further aggravated when the ruling group feels it necessary to reward or appease the military with excessive salaries or extravagant military purchases not truly required by the threat to national security, and which drain off scarce resources which could be used for development. Thus, we need to avoid a process of circular causation in which the effort to provide security ironically produces economic problems which contribute to greater instability.

Our challenge is to tailor our security assistance so that it is sufficient to the requirements of any real external threat, and yet conducive to a peaceful and productive amelioration of internal instabilities. We are looking at a number of ways to meet this challenge.

By the end of the Carter Administration, there were no MAP funds for Africa. Our fiscal year 1984 request is more than four-fifths MAP. We have sharply reduced, and plan to eliminate entirely, FMS credit for countries, such as those in Africa, which cannot afford it. We seek legitimate needs through the Military Assistance Program.

There are proposals being readied to move security assistance on-budget and thus to inflict the discipline of the budget on ourselves, rather than creating credit card armies that are an unaffordable luxury to those who purchase them.

In the Pentagon, we are looking very closely at how we can direct security assistance toward civic action: nation-building by the military elements of our assistance recipients. This would mean less emphasis on lethal systems and more on the hardware and the skills that can build roads, dig wells, clear land for planting, rebuild ports and harbors and generally contribute to the economic infrastructure of the nation, all within the service of its real security. Out of this should come skills transferable to civilian employment. Out of it should come a new sense of the relationship between the military and the people—so they are seen truly as protectors and contributors rather than as privileged parasites.

I discussed this recently with our Ambassadors to Africa, and there was immediate, universal enthusiasm.

We are looking for ways to help our friends take the equipment they have and restore it, rather than buying new equipment. This increasingly finds us in the seemingly fantastic situation of saying, why don't we see if we can fix those East German trucks you bought when you were cozy with the Soviets, rather than buying nice, shiny new, expensive American trucks. They don't believe what they are hearing. Some of our defense contractors probably wouldn't believe it, either.

But the point is we do not fit the stereotyped image of the arms merchant, and we are trying to help our friends defend themselves and not to help them destroy themselves.

We must, all of the above notwithstanding, acknowledge that many nations are threatened and, being threatened, deserve and ought to have the means to defend themselves.

So the real issue is how those means are provided. We believe, in spite of the criticism—much of which is well-founded, and all of which is well-intentioned—that on balance our record, America's record, in this arena is a good one.

To put that record in perspective, we must see that we are dealing with nations that most frequently want genuinely to remain non-aligned, nations which are understandably touchy about matters of sovereignty, and nations which are not always well-equipped to manage all those elements of a security assistance relationship which they would like to have.

Many see a modern, heavily-equipped military not merely as a defense requirement, but as a symbol of nationhood—like a national airline, for example, and just as costly. To argue against acquiring such a symbol is often seen as an argument against the country's very right to nationhood, and in the third world this is a delicate thing.

One of the standard arguments we hear in favor of providing security assistance, where objective considerations seem to mitigate against it, is that if we don't provide it, the nation will go to the Soviets for help. I'm frequently skeptical of this argument and its implicit threat, but taking it at face value, and looking at the matter outside the parameters of East-West competition, looking at it in terms of the interests of the aid recipient, we can ask why is it better for us to provide assistance than to abandon the ground to the Soviets.

There are distinct differences in the objectives of the two powers, and the way they run their assistance programs. Those differences go to the heart of the question of nonalignment, or neutrality.

The Soviet objective is to create through security assistance a profound degree of dependence on the part of the aid recipient. This is accomplished in several ways. One is by not teaching the recipients how to maintain the equipment provided to them. Thus, maintenance can only be carried out by Soviet technicians, and this in turn requires that a large number of technicians be permitted into the country. These come with the hidden mission of exerting their influence throughout the recipients' military, political, and social affairs, and by sheer force of numbers, they frequently succeed.

Another method of maintaining dependence is to stock in-country only the most limited supplies of spare parts and repair items. Major maintenance requires requisitioning on a case by case, as-needed basis, or returning the equipment to the Soviet Union or Eastern bloc nations. The result of this approach is that should the relationship be broken, the departing Soviets leave behind them a military force whose equipment is almost immediately useless. Africa is a virtual junkyard of Soviet equipment resulting from this doctrine. So while the host government may become disenchanted with their relationship with the Soviets, it takes a considerable measure of courage to get them to leave. It means going back and beginning again the effort to build their forces.

Finally, I noted earlier that the U.S. usually requires payment for its hardware and other assistance. So do the Soviets, but their approach is insidious. They often offer long grace periods with seemingly low rates of interest. But in, say, eight or ten years when the bills come due for equipment that often by then is obsolete or obsolescent (and may have been when it was initially transferred), the Soviets demand cash on the barrel head. Unlike Western nations which will roll over debts or provide bridging loans, the Soviets demand hard currency or quid pro quos such as recasting the debtor's governmental system along the Soviet model, access to natural resources, fishing rights, disadvantageous trade arrangements, or allowing the establishment or expansion of Soviet military bases. The relationship rapidly becomes analagous to that which obtains between migrant workers and the company store. The end result is de facto slavery.

Let me briefly describe the plight of Ethiopia and Angola, two of the major beneficiaries of Soviet assistance. Both nations are plagued by civil wars that scream out for diplomatic resolution. Were the U.S. the benefactor of these nations, I can assure you we would be limiting military aid while pushing hard for meaningful negotiations were the opposition willing. We do this routinely; indeed, it is what we did in the 1960's and 1970's when Haile Selassie ruled Ethiopia.

The Soviets, on the other hand, have turned the military aid spigot wide open, leading their clients in Luanda and Addis Ababa to seek spectral military victories. In point of fact, the military situation is steadily worsening in both countries.

The Angolans pay for this equipment and the well-fed Cubans who accompany it with much of their oil revenues while normal municipal services are becoming a thing of the past and people literally fight for scraps of food in the street. Ethiopia is not blessed with oil; it is saddled with an evergrowing debt to the Soviets that will take generations to pay off. However, this is a burden that many Ethiopian children will never have to bear since dozens of them starve to death every day.

Meanwhile the Soviets are ensconced along the Red Sea and in the South Atlantic, the two main routes for Persian Gulf oil to flow to Western Europe and the United States. And should Angolan or Ethiopian leaders decide that the price isn't worth the candle and try to oust the Soviets as Sadat and Nimieri courageously did in the past? Well, they will look around them and see thousands upon thousands of Cuban combat troops and remember the fate of Maurice Bishop.

The United States doctrine is almost a reverse mirror image of the Soviets. We have no interest in dictating a country's governmental system nor in replacing its religious beliefs with an alien ideology.

We have no difficulty with the concept of non-alignment or neutrality, noting that there are many neutral countries in the free world; there are none in the communist world. So we are interested not in creating dependence among those who turn to us for assistance, but rather in fostering independence.

The lion's share of our assistance goes to teaching aid recipients how to function independently. We place the highest emphasis on training in maintenance, on providing equipment that is easily maintained so as not to overload local capabilities. We emphasize the importance of logistics, so that equipment and uses are properly supported.

We emphasize commonality and interoperability of systems to keep support and maintenance as uncomplicated as possible. We teach such things as how to inventory parts and to run supply systems—which is the unglamorous backbone of every military, as it is of virtually any other organization. And we provide adequate spare parts and backup systems so that the desired self-reliance can be achieved and sustained.

As we compare the overall results and consequences of our approach to that of the Soviets, I think it is defensible, creditable, and consistent with those very values which raise legitimate questions about our security assistance programs. I hope I have been able to answer some of those questions today.●

METRIC EVALUATION ACT OF 1981

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago I received in the mail a publication entitled "What do Brunei, Burma, and the United States Have in Common?" The publication was issued by the American National Metric council, a private sector membership organization, and on the inside pages the answer was provided: Brunei, Burma, and the United States are the only countries in the world not committed to using metric measurements.

Over the last 35 years all the countries in the world which formerly used the English system of weights and measures have committed themselves to the metric system. For example, most of the countries of the British Commonwealth are in this category, and many have already completed the changeover, including such important trading partners of the United States as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

The bill I am introducing today would authorize the conduct of a comprehensive, one-time study of the current status of metric use in the United States. It would analyze the extent and impact, both present and prospective, of conversion to metric in American industry, including such important factors as costs, import and export implications, and the effect of not making the changeover to metric. The bill would direct the Science and Technology Adviser to the President to appoint a small, seven-member panel to define the specific scope of the study and to select a contractor to conduct the study on an impartial basis. At the end of a 2-year period a report on the study would be submitted by the President to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the metric system is now being taught in many of the school systems around the country. Many industries, including the automobile industry, the farm implement industry, and others are in the process of changing to metric. But we have little hard data on which to base specific conclusions about whether there is a need for stronger leadership and commitment by the Government in this area. Brunei and Burma, unlike the United States, are not major factors in world trade, and it is timely that we obtain a factually based study on the implication for our future arising from the lack of a clear policy in this field.

H.R. 4490

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Metric Evaluation Act of 1981".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the use of the metric system of measurement was recommended by Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams at the time of the founding of the United States;

(2) in 1866 the Congress of the United States stated it was lawful to employ the metric system in the United States;

(3) the 1971 Report on the United States Metric Study conducted by the Department of Commerce at the request of the United States Congress recommended a ten-year period of changeover in which the United States should become predominantly, though not exclusively, metric;

(4) in 1975 the Congress of the United States passed and the President signed Public Law 94-168 (the Metric Conversion Act of 1975) which declared that "the policy of the United States shall be to coordinate and plan the increasing use of the metric system in the United States, and to establish a United States Metric Board to coordinate the voluntary conversion to the metric system";

(5) in 1978 a report by the United States General Accounting Office raised doubts with regard to the economic need for and the feasibility of converting to the SI metric system;

(6) the majority of the trading partners of the United States, including the members of the European Economic Community, Japan, Canada, and Mexico either currently use or are committed to the SI metric standard of measurement; and

(7) there is a need to objectively evaluate the data bearing on conversion to the SI metric standard of measurement in the United States.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to authorize an independent study of all factors relating to the conversion to the SI metric standard of measurement in the United States.

AUTHORIZATION OF STUDY

SEC. 3. (a) The President is authorized to have conducted a comprehensive study of the extent of conversion to the Metric system of weights and measurements in the United States.

(b) The President shall appoint a panel of not to exceed 7 persons to establish criteria for eligible bidders to perform the study authorized by this Act and to act in an advisory capacity to the selected study contractor. Among persons appointed to the panel the President shall include representatives from the public sector and the private sector. Such panel shall report to the Science and Technology Adviser to the President.

(c) Members of such panel, other than full-time employees of the Federal Government, while attending meetings of such panel shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government serving without pay.

(d) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, through the Science and Technology Adviser to the President, shall promulgate the criteria for eligible bidders to conduct the study described in section 4.

(e) Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this act, the President, through the Science and Technology Adviser of the President, shall enter into a contract with a qualified nongovernmental entity to conduct the study described in section 4.

STUDY AND REPORT

SEC. 4. (a) The study authorized by this Act shall include—

(1) an analysis of the extent and impact, present and prospective, of conversion to the SI metric system in the materials industry, including the minerals industry (ferrous and nonferrous), the nonmetallic materials industry, the forest product industry, the petrochemical industry, and the agricultural materials industry;

(2) an analysis of the extent and impact, present and prospective, of conversion to the SI metric system in the machinery industry including motors, complex machine tools, instruments, and other similar items;

(3) a cost/benefit analysis, to include the cost of not converting to the predominant use, of the SI metric system;

(4) an analysis of potential export opportunities if United States suppliers use the SI metric system of measurement;

(5) an analysis of the benefits and problems which the conversion to the SI metric system of measurement in the materials and machinery sectors would have upon small business; and

(6) any other topics which may be pertinent to such study as may be determined by the panel.

(b) In conducting such study the contractor shall conduct indepth discussions with corporate executives and labor movement officials in both large and small enterprises, and other appropriate individuals to obtain a clear picture of the attitudes towards and effects of metrication.

(c) Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act the President shall submit a report to the Congress on the results and conclusions of the study conducted pursuant to this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated $700,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.●

A YOUNG MAN'S DESIRE FOR PEACE

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter sent to my office by Mr. James Findlay of Peace Dale, R.I. Mr. Findlay forwarded to me a copy of a letter to President Reagan that was written by his son, Peter. Peter Findlay died of leukemia on October 31, 1983. I believe that Peter's letter speaks eloquently of a young man's desire for peace in the world, even at a time when he knew his own death was near.

The letter follows:

NOVEMBER 4, 1983.

Congresswoman CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SCHNEIDER: My son was one of your constituents. He wrote this letter at Brown, a week before he entered the hospital for the final time. In the confusion of the last eight weeks the letter never got mailed immediately to President Reagan. Now we are doing so. I am sending a copy of his letter to you so his concerns and commitments are known to a politician who cares very much about the same things.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FINDLAY.

Enclosures.

DEAR PRESIDENT REAGAN: For the past three years of my life I have been fighting the lethal disease Leukemia. I am twenty years old and have had every tested chemotherapeutic drug on the market pumped into my veins. Dealing with Leukemia, every day, is often "living hell," combining long stretches of nausea, vomiting, pain, and the constant knowledge that you will die. This situation exists even with the finest medical care available. I fear and know death as a reality every day. This knowledge would surely have made me insane if not for my Christian faith and the love given to me by my family and friends.

As one may expect, I have learned many things not usually shown people in a normal lifetime. I have realized that life is precious. Life should be nurtured and sustained at all costs. Nothing is more sacred than life and God's love within it and all humanity.

With my very life, experience of love, and the teachings of Jesus as testament, I witness that your stance on Arms Reduction and Disarmament is deplorable. I understand that Arms Control is a technical subject and that no easy answers are available. However, since you call yourself a Christian, I can only condemn your policies of a nuclear arms buildup and cold relations with the Soviet Union as un-christian and spiritually wrong. As a Christian leader of the most powerful nation in the world, you can show the world the blessings of love and understanding by having faith in what Jesus taught us, to love our neighbors and to love and pray for our enemies. Love and understanding are the answers, not uncompromising rhetoric or increased stockpiles of nuclear weapons. The Russians may be untrustworthy, but so also were the Jewish priests and scribes when Jesus did his work. Mr. President, you must be like Jesus, listening not to your advisors, be they conservative or liberal, republican or democrat. You must be guided solely by the love of God and your Christian faith. This faith is not one of strength or numbers, but of humble and firm knowledge that for life to continue, love must preside over all people and things.

I pray, in Jesus' name, that you will be guided in love, truth, and a disregard for ideology. As Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, "blessed are the peacemakers." May the Lord guide you with the greatest of speed in this direction. The very existence of all creatures on Earth depends upon your decisions. I have lived with Leukemia. I know what millions of people will experience if a nuclear war does occur. Those living will truly envy the dead. I am calling on you from deep within my heart to leave no stone unturned in an attempt to end the arms race and disarm the nuclear nations of Earth. There seem to be many unturned stones as of yet. I have faith in you and humanity.

With unending hope for peace.

PETER F. FINDLAY.●

ANDROPOV IS ALREADY FIGHTING THE BIG WAR

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, when Yuri Andropov emerged as the leader of the Soviet Union, the Western media initially depicted him as one with whom Western governments might enter into serious peace negotiations. Remember his reported eye for western jeans, alcohol, and movies. Unfortunately, Yuri Andropov, the ex-head of the KGB, is responsible for gross violations of human rights in the Soviet Union as well as the brutal invasion of Afghanistan and possibly the assassination attempt on the Pope, according to Vladimir Solovyov and Elena Klepikova, a husband and wife team born in the Soviet Union. The following piece suggests that Andropov is not at all committed to world peace, but in fact he is already at war with the world to increase the fortunes of the Soviet Empire:

ANDROPOV IS ALREADY FIGHTING THE BIG WAR

(By Vladimir Solovyov and Elena Klepikova)

The trouble with many predictions is not that the events that follow refute them, but that they outstrip them.

George Orwell wrote his anti-Utopia about a totalitarian society and dated it "1984." A quarter of a century later, the Soviet dissident Andrei Amalrik published abroad a Cassandralike essay "Will The Soviet Union Exist Until 1984?" Only several months remain until the appointed date. But the last empire on earth hasn't shown any signs of collapse, although it now exists in somewhat different condition than was described by Mr. Orwell and witnessed by Mr. Amalrik. For the last few years, its political structure has been changing radically. One may risk saying that the Soviet Union whose inevitable destruction Mr. Amalrik predicted has indeed ceased to exist—several years prior to the appointed date.

This happened with the coming of new leadership to the Kremlin—not the day after Leonid Brezhnev's death but in the last years of his nominal rule when the military-police apparatus, with Yuri Andropov as its head, gradually drove back and ultimately replaced the former party-bureaucratic ruling clique.

As a landmark of this historical displacement, a watershed between two epochs in the life of the Soviet empire, we can consider Christmas Eve 1979 when the Red Army assaulted and annexed the neighboring state of Afghanistan. This event was unprecedented in the post-Stalin era in two respects. First, Afghanistan, unlike Hungary and Czecholovakia, had been outside the Iron Curtain. Then, the decision to occupy Afghanistan was made without the Politburo's sanction, bypassing the opinion of the majority of its members. These included the main Soviet leaders—General Secretary Brezhnev, Premier Alexei Kosygin and Mikhail Suslov (a party ideologue), who were all seriously ill at the time in the "Kremlyovka" (a VIP Kremlin hospital).

The main architect of the blitzkrieg in Afghanistan was Gen. Aleksei Epishev, chief of the Armed Forces Political Administration, who went on official visits to Afghanistan with a group of military specialists several times during 1979. He worked out on the spot a detailed plan of the invasion, which was subsequently approved by Mr. Andropov, then chief of the KGB, and Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, chief of the general staff. Mr. Ogarkov was and is now de facto minister of defense in the shadow of the aged and strictly ceremonial Dmitri Ustinov. (You may recall Mr. Ogarkov's unflappable performance on the live televised news conference from Moscow after the downing of the Korean airliner.)

The occupation of Afghanistan was a decisive factor in the struggle for power. Although the well-planned blitzkrieg turned into a protracted war, Mr. Andropov's political fortunes rose sharply, he easily outstripped all his rivals from Mr. Brezhnev's retinue and in the beginning of 1982 carried out his police coup, removing the Party Areopagus that ruled the country for almost three decades in a row since Nikita Khrushchev.

It's only natural that all of Mr. Andropov's actions—first, as an all-powerful regent while Mr. Brezhnev was still alive, and now as an official Soviet leader (beginning with the assault on Afghanistan up to the shooting down of an unarmed Korean airliner with 269 passengers aboard)—were exactly opposite to what Mr. Brezhnev had done.

Mr. Andropov eradicated dissent inside the country, tightened the screws on all levels of Soviet life, stopped the Jewish emigration, broke off the policy of detente, adopted a harsh, aggressive tone in his talks with the West and increased expenditures for the country's growing militarization. He also strengthened ties with world terrorism and even tried to make use of it in solving the Polish crisis (the attempt on the Polish pope's life). Mr. Andropov undertook an adventurous and expansionist program in Southeast Asia and the Middle East—in the first instance, with the help of Vietnam, in the second, with the help of Syria and Libya. (Let us avoid the temptation of false analogy and not ascribe to Mr. Andropov the Central American conflicts with their quite internal, social causes; of course, the possibility of their exploitation by the Soviet Union and Cuba is not ruled out.)

It's time to call things by their proper names: What we see now is not simply the second round of the Cold War after prolonged intermission, but a direct confrontation between two superpowers that includes military confrontation although for now it takes place in separate arenas. It is hardly probable that the Middle East will become a second Vietnam for America.

But in other respects, its theater of military operations may turn out to be much more dangerous than Vietnam, since it is difficult to contain it geographically and the fires of war spread easily from one place to another. In addition, since the Soviet Union obviously wants to make the Middle East a proving ground where it can test its strength, it hampers in every way possible the peaceful settlement of local conflicts.

Peace is a tactical ruse for the current Soviet leader and not his goal at all. The U.S., to be sure, isn't ruled by Nobel Peace Prize laureates, either, but it doesn't shoot down civilian airplanes, doesn't seize other countries, doesn't set one nation against another and doesn't direct the activity of terrorists. Compared to the chess-player Andropov, President Reagan seems politically naive and infantile, and his rhetorical philippics against communism are like the Chinese "paper tigers."

The point is not whether the U.S. is capable of standing up to Mr. Andropov's Russia but whether America, its leaders and people are capable of realizing that the war with Russia is already under way.●

REPORT OF REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the majority party has spent the last 2 years trying to blame triple-digit deficits on President Reagan. Yet they are in charge of a House constitutionally given the power of the purse, and they have allowed no serious consideration of spending control le‹ islation since the June 1981 reconciliaιion bill.

So far during the 97th Congress the majority party has consistently tried to raise both taxes and spending—the latter more than the former, making their concern about deficits ring hollow indeed.

The Republican Study Committee's economist, Michael J. Solon, has prepared a masterly report that presents the evidence of Democratic irresponsibility.

But the forces on my side of the aisle, while consistently pointing out that Democratic overspending is the biggest part of the deficit problem, have not exactly been offering the solution. Solon's report notes:

While this data provides us a more than adequate defense against the Democrats' charge of cruel budget cuts, it can also be used for self-criticism. President Reagan and his allies in Congress have done too little to bring spending under control. The job remains undone. The Democrats are still controlling the spending spigot.

In short, this new RSC paper has the potential to quiet down the majority and wake up the minority. It follows:

EVERYTHING THE DEMOCRATS "DON'T" WANT YOU TO KNOW ABOUT THE DEFICIT

The intent of this package is to provide Republican Members with information which may be helpful to them in confronting the Democrats on the deficit issue. This package includes:

(1) Examples of how Democrats have voted numerous times to increase the deficit;

(2) The long-term projections of deficit growth and revenues need to offset that growth;

(3) Examples of how Democrats use the deficit to gut defense, raise taxes and increase social welfare spending;

(4) Inconsistencies and illogical policies resulting from the uncontrolled growth in social welfare spending programs; and

(5) Information on how President Reagan's spending cuts only reflect lower inflation adjusted spending and that the President's policies have been more than fair to those supporting themselves as well as those on social welfare payments.

DEMOCRATS VOTE FOR DEFICITS

(1) House Concurrent Resolution 91, June 23, 1983. This bill raised taxes by $10 billion, cut defense by $12 billion, increased the deficit by $13 billion above the President's requested level (CBO estimates $8.5 billion), and added social welfare expenditures of $29 billion. Passed 239-186. Congressional Record, Page 17103. Only 29 Democrats voted against H. Con. Res. 91, those being Applegate, Barnard, Bennett, Breaux, Chappell, Dellums, Dyson, S. Hall, R. Hall, Huckaby, Hutto, Ireland, Jacobs, Kastenmeier, Leath, McDonald, Montgomery, Neal, Ray, Roemer, Shelby, Skelton, Smith (IA), Stark, Stenholm, Tauzin, Vandergiff and Wilson.

Those Democrats not voting were Alexander, Heftel and Martinez.

(2) H.R. 1183, June 23, 1983. Unwilling to lower the deficit by cutting spending, Democrats attempted through this bill to cap the tax cut and raise revenues of $6.2 billion in 1984 and an additional $39 billion through 1988. Passed 267-155. Congressional Record, Page 17146. Only three Democrats voted against capping the tax cut, those being Frank, Mazzoli and Studds. Those Democrats not voting were Gore, Heftel, Jacobs, Leland, Martinez and Rose.

(3) H.R. 1183, June 23, 1983 (Frenzel Amendment). A motion was made to recommit and amend the bill with a specific limit lowering outlays by $12 billion. This was a $12 billion spending cut with no increase in taxes. Defeated 181-241. Congressional Record, Page 17148. Only 17 Democrats voted for the spending cut, those being Byron, English, S. Hall, R. Hall, Hightower, Hutto, Ireland, Leath, Long (MD), McDonald, Ray, Roemer, Shelby, Stenholm, Tauzin, Vandergriff and Young (MO). Those Democrats not voting were Gore, Heftel, Jacobs, Leland, Martinez and Rose.

(4) H.R. 3913, September 22, 1983 (Wright Amendment). This amendment added $300 million to an already overbudget Labor, HHS and Education Appropriations bill. Passed 302-111. Congressional Record, Page 25424. Only 9 Democrats voted against this bill, those being Bennett, Breaux, Huckaby, Ireland, Montgomery, Roemer, Slattery, Stenholm and Tauzin. Those Democrats not voting were Daniel, Hance, Heftel, Howard, Martinez, Rahall, Sharp, Simon and Waxman. Note: During debate, Majority Leader Wright stated "Now they (the proposed amounts) may be in excess of certain amounts requested by the President in his budget request last January. But that, of course, is not the budget. Congress makes the budget; the President does not. That is a very important distinction."

(5) H.R. 1036, September 21, 1983. (Gekas Amendment) This pay-as-you-go amendment would have ensured that the $3.5 billion needed for this bill would have to be funded by some other method rather than increasing the deficit. Defeated 166-258. Congressional Record, Page 25110. Only thirty-two Democrats voted for this amendment, those being Andrews, Breaux, Britt, Coleman, Daniel, English, Erdreich, Gibbons, Glickman, R. Hall, S. Hall, Hightower, Hubbard, Ireland, Kazen, MacKay, Miller, Montgomery, Nelson, Penny, Reid, Roemer, Rowland, Sharp, Shelby, Stenholm, Tauzin, Thomas, Valentine and Vandergriff. Those Democrats not voting were Barnard, Crockett, Daschle, Ferraro, Heftel and Morrison. Note: Ex-CBO chief Alice Rivlin noted that Government job programs made limited overall improvement in unemployment rates while tending to increase the deficit which in turn stifled economic recovery. She also noted that these programs create fewer net new jobs because they usually pay for high skill, high wage construction jobs on roads. She referred to a 1978 jobs programs that cost $38,000 per created job in 1978 dollars. Her solution: "Get the economy moving again".

(6) H.R. 3133, June 2, 1983. This appropriation bill as passed was $4.84 billion over the levels requested by the President. Passed 216-143. Congressional Record, Page 14337. Thirty-nine Democrats voted against this bill, those being Applegate, Barnard, Breaux, Byron, Daniel, Dorgan, Dyson, Eckart, English, Feighan, Fowler, S. Hall, R. Hall, Hance, Hubbard, Huckaby, Hughes, Hutto, Ireland, Jenkins, LaFalce, Levitas, Lowry, Lundine, McCurdy, McDonald, Montgomery, Moody, Mrazek, Neal, Nichols, Patterson, Ray, Roemer, Russo, Slattery, Stenholm, Tauzin and Vandergriff. Those Democrats not voting were AuCoin, Berman, Boner, Bonker, Clay, Collins, Conyers, Crockett, Derrick, Dixon, Florio, Foglietta, Frost, Harkin, Hawkins, Heftel, Jones, Kazen, Kolter, Kostmayer, Lehman, Levine, Lloyd, Martinez, McNulty, Mica, Nelson, Panetta, Price, Rahall, Rowland, Sabo, Simon, Sisisky, Skelton, Smith (Fla), Stratton, Torres, Traxler, Weiss and Wilson.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION'S CONGRESSIONAL SPENDING STUDY

With the understanding that big spending requires heavy taxation, the National Taxpayers Union has studied the spending patterns of the U.S. Congress to see who has actually held spending down. The study is based on votes from the first and second sessions of the 97th Congress.

Of those who had the best record for spending restraint during the first session of the 97th Congress, only 3 of the 35 were Democrats, of which two, Congressmen Gramm and Stump, have switched parties while the other, Congressman McDonald, died in the K.A.L. 007 incident. All of those rated as worst of the big spenders were Democrats including Gonzalez, Pepper, Fazio, Wright, Zablocki, Boggs, Murtha, Price, Matsui, Zeffretti, Mollohan, Akaka, Perkins, Gore, Bailey, Stratton, Foley, Dixon, Annunzio, Bowen, Florio, Natcher, Bollings, Boland, Alexander, Whitten, W. Coyne, G. Long, Fary, Coelho, Rostenkowski, J. Smith, Simon, Anthony, Dicks, McHugh, Dymally, and Frost.

The N.T.U. study of the second session of the 97th showed the same pattern. Only 5 Democrats, McDonald, Gramm, Stump, Roemer, and Stenholm, were in the group of 38 rated as spending less while no Republicans were in the group rated as big spenders. The worst of the big spenders were Bailey, Wright, Price, Pepper, Mollohan, Fary, St Germain, Akaka, Zablocki, Katie Hall, J. Smith, Hoyer, Boggs, W. Coyne, Dwyer, Matsui, G. Long, Bowen, G. Brown, Simon, Dicks, Fazio, Dingell, Foley, Frost, Annunzio, Martinez, Murtha, Gejdenson, Kennelly, Roe, Foglietta, Gore, and Mineta.

After reviewing the record and how the Democrat leadership has treated those Democrat Members who voted for less spending, there should be no doubt as to which party is the party of big spenders and, ultimately, big taxers.

$200 BILLION DEFICITS OR $200 BILLION TAX INCREASES

Projections based on the relation between federal revenues and outlays indicate that we could be experiencing deficits of $565 to $615 billion by 1990 and up to $2 to $2.5 trillion by the year 2000. This projection is based on the growing ratio of outlay as a multiple of revenues.

In 1975, outlays were 116 percent of revenues leaving a deficit of $45 billion. 1983 estimates show outlays being 135 percent of revenues.

Since 1975, the average annual increase in outlays has been 12.0 percent while revenues have grown at a 10.0 percent rate. Based on that growth projection, 1990 outlays will be $1.78 trillion while revenues should be $1.164 trillion leaving a deficit of $615 billion!

Revenues grew at a 10 percent average annual rate from 1975 to 1983. If we decided to increase revenues at a 12 percent average annual rate for the next ten years, we would still have to hold outlay increases to an average annual growth rate of 8.7 percent in order to have no deficit at the end of those ten years. That is 3.3 percent lower than the outlay trend since 1975. If we did not want to increase the tax burden and keep revenue growth at the current 10 percent average annual rate, then outlay growth would have to be cut from the current 12 percent rate to 6.8 percent average annual growth, almost by half.

What does this mean to the average family? The average family having an annual income of $24,100 pays $2,218 or 9.2 percent of their income in taxes. If they paid enough taxes to balance the budget, the average family would have to pay $3,832 or 15.9 percent of their income in taxes, an increase of 72.8 percent.

By ranking 1983 as a multiple of 1958, we see that: Defense spending has grown by a factor 4.9, personal income minus federal outlays has grown 6.9 times, personal income rose by 7.56 times, personal income taxes by a factor of 8.31, total federal outlays by 9.25 times and total transfer payments by 19.34 times.

This data clearly shows what is causing the deficit and what is not. As a percentage of Gross National Product, defense is 33.3 percent lower than the 1958 level but federal outlays overall are 33.9 percent higher.

Some Members look to national industrial policies to allow us to compete with countries like Japan. The facts are that government spending in Japan is 9.7 percent of GNP, 46 percent lower than the 18.1 percent here in the U.S. and average investment as a percentage of GNP in Japan is 32.1 percent while here in the U.S. the average is 18.3 percent.

Federal spending growth is due mostly to entitlements and the fact is that after we pay all our entitlement obligations, we have only $100.6 billion to run the government. With defense and other needs, it simply can't be done. Take the estimated revenues for the government in 1983 of $597.5 billion, then subtract $210.3 for revenues collected for transfer programs, take away another $61.1 billion for the deficit from the lack of revenues collected for these transfer programs, subtract $136.6 billion for all other transfer payments and another $88.9 billion for interest and it leaves the Federal Government with some $100.6 billion to run all other functions. You can't run the government on $100 billion.

BALANCED APPROACH TO THE DEFICIT

A number of Members are calling for a balanced approach to reducing the deficit involving lower defense spending, higher revenues and cutting entitlements. This sort of balanced approach has been attempted before in the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA). TEFRA raised taxes $100 billion over three years. The 1983 First Budget Resolution reflected $280 billion in outlay reductions, supposedly cutting outlays nearly $3 for every one dollar in higher taxes ($280 billion/$100 billion).

Last year, Congress agreed to cut $53 billion in non-defense spending, reduced defense spending $26 billion, and raised taxes for fiscal year 1983, fiscal year 1984, and fiscal year 1985. Since then non-defense spending estimates have been revised upward by $167 billion (exclusive of interest payments reductions), for a net increase of $114 billion ($167 billion-$53 billion) of expected outlays in excess of the baseline used in the fiscal year 1983 Resolution. Far from achieving a $3 cut in non-defense spending for every $1 in tax increases in TEFRA, or even 53 cents per $1 in tax increases, we may end up with a $1.14 increase in non-defense spending for each each $1 of tax increase in TEFRA ($114 billion/$100 billion).

Balanced approaches like this lead to deficits because Democrats refuse to control or limit constantly rising social spending, the real cause of deficits. The deficit results from the inability of taxes to keep up with uncontrolled growth in spending.

WORK OR WELFARE: CLEAR CHOICES

There is no doubt that we need to help those incapable of supporting themselves, but should we encourage able bodied people not to work and join welfare programs? The combination of our policies clearly indicate that we reward people not to work and punish them with high taxes if they do work.

A 1981 study in New York State showed that a family of 4 received $8,333 in benefits (AFDC=$3,096, Shelter Allowance=$2,580, Food Stamps=$948, Medicare=$1,709). For a worker to come up with that same amount after taxes, he would have to earn $9,731 per year. When you divide this $9,731 by the standard hours worked per year of 2,000, you end up with that worker having to earn $4.87 per hour to match what he could receive under welfare payments. That is 145 percent of the $3.35 minimum wage. In addition, entitlements are indexed to inflation, but the minimum wage has not increased since that time, therefore by now the welfare payments are probably somewhere in the range of 160-165 percent of the minimum wage. We give people an obvious choice: if you work we will pay you $3.35 per hour and then tax the income, but if you decide not to work, we will give you $4.87 per hour for the forty hours a week you don't work.

FAIR TO ALL CONCERNED

Reagan's economic policies have been fair to all those involved. For the elderly, lower inflation has allowed senior citizens to maintain the value of their savings and pensions that were ravaged by inflation during the late 1970's. For the average family, lower inflation has added $2,500 a year of purchasing power to what it would have been if the 1980 rate had continued. Combined with the tax cuts, the average family has about $3,200 a year more in purchasing power than it would have.

But what about the poor? Have they not suffered from the massive spending cuts imposed under President Reagan. No, they are in fact better off than under Carter. Under Carter's first two fiscal years, payments to individuals adjusted for all important inflation increased 0.79 percent from 1977-78 and increased 1.4 percent the following year. Under Reagan's first two fiscal years, real payments to individuals grew 3.3 percent from 1981-82 and an estimated 7.0 percent in 1983. So under President Reagan, payments to individuals, when adjusted for lower inflation, grew over 10.0 percent in his first two years, almost five times as much as the growth during President Carter's first two years.

While this data provides us a more than adequate defense against the Democrats' charge of cruel budget cuts, it can also be used for self-criticism. President Reagan and his allies in Congress have done too little to bring spending under control. The job remains undone. The Democrats are still controlling the spending spigot.●

THE AUBURN DAM

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a legislative package consisting of two bills designed specifically to address those problems which have prevented the completion of a sorely needed water project in the State of California.

This project, the Auburn Dam, is located on the north fork of the American River near the community of Auburn. It was originally authorized in 1965 as part of a network of federally built dams and canals known as the central valley project. As part of the central valley project, the Auburn Dam was designed to help meet California's demanding water needs. Among this project's many features is the ability to provide a supplemental water supply for irrigation, municipal and industrial use, and to alleviate badly depleted ground water conditions. Additionally, the project is designed to provide environmentally clean hydropower generation, flood control, recreational facilities, and fish enhancement and protection.

In California over 70 percent of the water runoff takes place in the north during the winter and spring seasons. Conversely, more than 80 percent of that water is consumed months later in the southern regions during the summer and fall. Mr. Speaker, I submit that there can be no doubt of the necessity for projects in California which provide efficient water storage and transportation provided that they are environmentally safe and fiscally responsible.

To date nearly $320 million has been spent preparing the dam site's foundation. However, all construction ceased after concerns were raised over the dam's safety when an earthquake occurred in nearby Butte County. Subsequent questions of the dam's effects on the American River flow levels were raised as well. Fortunately, the Bureau of Reclamation, under whose auspices this project lies, has since been able to account for these problems, insuring both seismic safety and proper minimum flow levels.

Although solutions to these two major problems which have caused lengthy delays for the Auburn project in the past have been reached, one major obstacle has yet to be addressed: The cost. In the 18 years since Auburn's original authorization, delays and inflation have pushed the project's price up almost $600 million. Existing law allows for $1.6 billion of authorization; however, present cost of completion has been estimated at $2.2 billion. Although I am wholeheartedly committed to the completion of this project and realize the unquestionable need for the contributions it will make to the agricultural and economic well-being of California, I also realize the serious consequences of unrestrained Federal spending as illustrated by the size of our current Federal budget deficit. I, therefore, share the administration's position that Auburn and projects like it can no longer be funded entirely by the Federal Government. In the first Auburn Dam bill that I am introducing today, I recognize that non-Federal entities must share in the cost and services of the project if it is ever to be constructed. Although cost-sharing approaches for public works projects have been used before, no applicable precedent exists for water projects. Without clear-cut funding commitments Congress has had no assurance in the past that appropriate agreements defining equitable and proportionate funding roles could be reached. As a result, I believe Members of this body have been hesitant to consider cost sharing as a fiscal panacea for water projects in the past. The first of these two Auburn Dam bills focuses on this funding problem specifically.

This bill amends the original authorization, directing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into negotiations with non-Federal entities interested in sharing in the costs and services of the project and subsequently to consummate cost-sharing agreements. It then goes a step further and mandates that the Secretary report back to Congress the resluts of the negotiations and submit any agreements he may have reached. This will give Congress the opportunity to examine the specifics of any cost-sharing contracts for the Auburn project before the dam's reauthorization ever occurs. There is every reason to believe that more than adequate non-Federal interest exists. At least nine entities have contacted the Bureau of Reclamation expressing interest in contributing to the project's cost.

The second part of this legislative package is a bill to amend the original authorization, raising the cost figures up to current cost estimates. It will also insure environmentally safe minimum flow levels for the American River. Other technical changes relating to water rights and the construction site have been made upon recommendation by the Bureau. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress that it is my intention to have consideration of this reauthorizing measure take place after the Secretary has reported his findings and cost-sharing agreements to Congress. In an effort to make the Federal Government's funding role both clear and responsible, we as a body will have an opportunity to carefully and satisfactorily review this necessary information before considering this reauthorizing bill.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents have patiently endured the unenviable position of having a half-built dam in their backyards for nearly 15 years now. The need for this project is clear. This legislation endeavors to make funding roles equitable and clear. Finally, I believe it is clear that the time for the Federal Government to stop spinning its wheels and act in a responsible fashion on a project it started in 1965 is now—before costs rise any further.●

PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON ENDING THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a series of events this week forces many Americans to consider solemnly the most critical issue of our time: the real and growing threat of nuclear war.

Earlier this week, the House passed the biggest appropriations bill in the history of this Nation—a quarter of a trillion dollars for the most awesome assortment of weaponry ever conceived by mankind. Later this week, millions of Americans will watch a film, "The Day After," which chronicles the aftermath of a world in which those kinds of terrible weapons of destruction have been loosed on the United States.

Yesterday, in the great rotunda of the Capitol, we conducted a memorial service to commemorate our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who was assassinated 20 years ago next Tuesday.

The world is very different today from the world President Kennedy knew. The dangers of nuclear weapons, and the threats of nuclear annihilation—whether intentional or by accident—are more real today than they were in 1963.

When President Kennedy issued his warnings about the dangers of nuclear warfare, there were no MX missiles or B-1 bombers. There was no Pershing II, no neutron bomb, no SS-20. The nuclear weapons which terrified President Kennedy are only a fraction of the nuclear arsenal which exists today, an arsenal equivalent to 5,000 times the explosive power of all the munitions of all sides in World War II.

President Kennedy did not shy away from military growth or from military confrontation. Within his brief administration, we endured serious military crises at the Bay of Pigs, Berlin, Vietnam, and the Cuban blockade. While President Kennedy felt his failures deeply, he did not respond to his successes with strident bravado or confrontational arrogance.

Instead, President Kennedy's brushes with nuclear conflict made him recognize the need both to pursue a strong defense and to seek ways of reducing the likelihood of war. After staring down our Soviet adversaries, he was willing to sit down with those same adversaries to seek ways of preventing nuclear conflagration.

"Let us never negotiate out of fear," he said in his inaugural address in 1961, "but let us never fear to negotiate."

Today, I fear, we have lost the inclination to negotiate for peace because our administration is flushed with the success of military victory. But thoughtful men and women, in this House and throughout the Nation, understand all too clearly that neither powerful weapons nor successful maneuvers diminish the need to reduce the nuclear threat through serious negotiations with the Soviet Union.

Five months before he died, President Kennedy delivered one of his most important speeches at the graduation ceremony of the American University. His words are more appropriate today than they were in 1963, because the threat of global nuclear war is greater today. During the last 20 years, there has been an enormous expansion in nuclear weaponry, and in the last several years, a disturbing deterioration in our relations with the Soviet Union.

President Kennedy acknowledged the need to expend billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them. But he noted, "the acquisition of such idle stockpile * * * is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace."

He challenged the notion that it is fanciful to speak of world peace and the control of nuclear weapons in a world which is riddled with conflict.

"Some say it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament. [But] I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of universal peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics dream.

"Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions.

"Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable."

In an era in which East-West tensions were as strained as they seem today, Kennedy asserted that the people of both the United States and the Soviet Union yearned for a reduction in the threat of conflict between our two great nations.

"Both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race.

"So let us not be blind to our differences, but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity."

If President Kennedy's words made sense in the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs, the Cuban missile crisis, and the Berlin crisis, then they surely make sense in the wake of KAL 007 and Poland.

Yet today, I fear that on both sides, our political leaders prefer to gloat on their military successes rather than recognizing, as did John Kennedy, that each success is one further step toward the unthinkable, but not impossible, nuclear holocaust.

Do not misunderstand my words: The Soviet leaders are wary of our intentions, committed to their political system, and confrontational in their style. Surely they regard us in precisely the same fashion. So if we are to move beyond this diplomatic gridlock, it will require a greater degree of trust and a greater commitment to peace than either side has exhibited in recent years.

And if assuring peace requires risks, how do they compare to the risks of a continued buildup in nuclear weapons and international confrontation which daily enhances the likelihood of nuclear accident, if not nuclear war? Is it not in the Soviet interest, as much as our own, to avert that tragedy?

"For in the final analysis," President Kennedy said, "our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet.

"We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal * * *. All we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours" of a nuclear exchange.

Those words took courage to utter in 1963, and they will require courage to act upon in 1983. But the stakes are the future of this planet and all the people of every country on it.

So as we recall President Kennedy, let us remember his most timely message: "We can seek a relaxation of tensions without relaxing our guard. And, for our part, we do not need to use threats to prove that we are resolute."

Unquestionably, we must be prepared to defend ourselves and our interests. That is one price of world leadership. But the world has grown too strong, our weapons too awesome, and the margin of error too minuscule to allow rhetoric and ideological rigidity to jeopardize our mutual efforts to remove the nuclear threat.●

ROLLA HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING BULLDOGS BAND

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend and recognize the great achievement of the Rolla High School Marching Bulldogs Band of Rolla, Mo. Indeed, it is quite an achievement that this band, the Rolla Marching Bulldogs Band, has earned the privilege of representing the great State of Missouri, as well as the States of Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and Iowa, in the great bands of the Orange Bowl field competition and in the Orange Bowl Parade this year. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of this achievement, and I know that Missouri's fine citizens are equally pleased and join me in applauding this accomplishment. I am pleased to insert into the RECORD, the following proclamation by the Governor of the great State of Missouri, Christopher S. Bond, who has proclaimed the week of December 25 to 31, 1983, as "Rolla Marching Bulldogs Week."

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, music reflects the higher values of civilization; and

Whereas, the high school music programs of our state reflect these values, offering young people a chance to achieve a high degree of competence in the musical arts; and

Whereas, Rolla High School, Rolla, Missouri, has maintained an excellent music program over many years; and

Whereas, the Rolla High School Marching Bulldogs Band earned the privilege of representing the Great State of Missouri—as well as the States of Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and Iowa—in the Great Bands of the Orange Bowl Field Competition and in the Orange Bowl Parade this year;

Now, therefore, I, Christopher S. Bond, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby proclaim the week of December 25 to 31, 1983, as "Rolla Marching Bulldogs Week" in Missouri and extend congratulations to the band and urging others to join in applauding and supporting this accomplishment.●

IMMEDIATE SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT IN GRENADA

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from my friend and fellow Kentuckian, Dr. John C. Redman, of the University of Kentucky's Department of Agricultural Economics in Lexington, Ky. I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading Dr. Redman's comments about the need of support of the President's decision to send troops to the island of Grenada.

Dr. Redman urges the Congress to stand behind the President in this regard. Furthermore, he is deeply concerned that anyone would "sit idly by and let Grenada develop into a strong Soviet naval base," particularly after his having visited Poland this past summer. His October 28 letter to me follows:

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Lexington, Ky., October 28, 1983.

Congressman CARROLL HUBBARD,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARROLL: I want to congratulate you on your instant support of President Reagan for sending the troops to kick the Cubans and the Soviets out of Grenada. Having returned from my second trip to Poland seeing how Russia restricts the freedom loving Poles, then the Korean air massacre and the Beirut bombings, and the many other infiltrations, I can't see how any responsible leader could sit idly by and let Grenada develop into a strong Soviet naval base. President Reagan could have been criticized severely if he had not acted.

The impression many of your colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, have given is to wait and see how the public sentiment develops before taking a position. I think you are very perceptive about Russia's intentions. As a former Marine officer, I appreciate your continued support of a strong tough policy toward Russia.

Sincerely yours,

DR. JOHN C. REDMAN,
Professor.●

MASSACHUSETTS SENATE RESOLUTION ON ETHIOPIAN JEWS

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

• Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, last month, the Massachusetts Senate adopted resolutions urging the Congress of the United States to assist in the tragic situation of Ethiopian Jews. I believe that these sentiments are important, and I would like to submit the text of the resolution for the RECORD:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ASSIST ETHIOPIAN JEWS THROUGH EVERY AVAILABLE MEANS

Whereas, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights guarantees to all persons the right of freedom of religion, the right to hold opinions without interference, the right to freedom from expulsion and the right to emigrate; and

Whereas, Ethiopian Jews are among the oldest continuous Jewish communities in existence, their history extending back for three thousand years; and

Whereas, the American people are becoming increasingly aware of the difficulties facing Ethiopian and are seeking ways to assist them; and

Whereas, the plight of Ethiopian Jews demand that the American people and all people of good will do everything possible to alleviate their suffering; now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Massachusetts Senate hereby urges the Congress of the United States to express to relevant foreign governments, our own country's concern for the welfare of the Ethiopian Jews and, in particular, their rights to emigrate freely and be it further

Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the Senate to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress of the United States and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth.

The resolutions were adopted on October 24, 1983, and signed by William M. Bulger, President of the Senate; Edward B. O'Neill, Clerk of the Senate, and Jack H. Backman, who had offered the amendment.

In my opinion, the action of the Massachusetts Senate is well taken, and this body should follow up on the letter to the Secretary of State cosigned by many of the Members.•

RESIGNATION OF MR. RICHARD O. HAASE, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE, GSA

HON. ROBERT A. YOUNG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

• Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is losing a capable and dynamic Commissioner of Public Buildings of the General Services Administration. Richard O. Haase has announced his resignation, effective December 2, to return to the private sector where he will be the director of a real estate investment trust. Dick has been Commissioner for 2 years, and in that period has injected an enthusiasm and spirit in the Public Buildings Service of GSA.

Dick brought to PBS business acumen acquired from 20 years experience in real estate appraisal and investing. Dick is a highly respected expert on real estate matters and has served on the board of a title insurance company and a savings and loan institution. He currently holds the designation of MAI—member, Appraisers Institute. Dick is a graduate of the Naval Academy and served in the Strategic Air Command, reaching the rank of captain.

I first met Dick when I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings in the 98th Congress. Dick made an extra effort to bring me up to speed on the Public Buildings Service (PBS) activities and programs. Dick was always available to me and my staff and, although we disagreed on certain issues, he kept his word whenever he gave it. His many appearances this year at subcommittee hearings were always a pleasure, for Dick brought professionalism and a sense of personal interest in subcommittee activities.

Dick's accomplishments at PBS are many. He initiated a successful program to outlease vacant, uncommitted space, currently earning the Government $5 million annually. Dick also initiated an opportunity purchase program to buy commercial buildings for use as Federal office buildings. This program was designed to reduce the Government's reliance on leased space for Federal office workers, while taking advantage of favorable prices for office buildings. PBS has purchased one building in Dallas, Tex., for $7 million, and is currently analyzing over 200 proposals received following public advertising of the program. Dick instituted challenges to local tax assessments of buildings leased by GSA where the Government would otherwise automatically pay property tax increases, and saved $500,000 in Washington, D.C., leased locations alone. This program will be applied nationwide in fiscal year 1984. Dick was instrumental in initiating a long-term lease for the commercial space at the Old Post Office, or Nancy Hanks Center, in Washington. This project, the first of its kind to open under the Cooperative Use Act, has brought life to an aging Federal building, while preserving the grandeur of this splendid 19th century structure. Currently, the National Endowment of the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are housed in refurbished offices, and several shops, foodstands and restaurants serve office workers from nearby Federal, city, and private office buildings as well as a growing number of tourists. The bell tower of the Old Post Office could well one day become a premier tourist attraction, since the tower is the second highest structure in Washington.

PBS, with the concurrence of Administrator Gerald Carmen, was reorganized to streamline the bureaucratic process. Dick set tough goals for his managers to meet, but the Government is better for it. Lower costs to clean buildings, reduced time to lease office space, and reduced time to design a Federal building have been accomplished with no decline in service.

I will miss Dick, but I wish him the best in his future endeavors.•

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 1983

• Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 65th anniversary of Latvian independence. It is our hope that this action will serve to remind the Soviets that the plight of the illegally occupied Latvian nation has not been forgotten.

Between the two world wars, this tiny country and its neighbors, Estonia and Lithuania, enjoyed a period of independence. However, they were soon to be absorbed by the Soviet Union just prior to World War II. Approximately 200,000 Latvians escaped at that time and about 100,000 of them settled in the United States. It is their efforts that have brought public awareness to the Latvian situation.

The citizens of Latvia lost not only their independence but also many of their rights. The Soviets embarked upon a campaign of cultural genocide. This began with a series of mass deportations in an attempt to destroy national unity. Preference for jobs and housing is given to non-ethnics as Latvians have become second-class citizens in their own country. By 1979, only 55 percent of the Latvian population was ethnically Latvian. The conditions which exist in Latvia are much worse than those in other eastern block states, such as Hungary and Poland which are allowed to retain their cultural identity.

During its 22 years of independence, the Latvian state was a responsible member of the world community and the League of Nations. Its incorporation into the Soviet Union was never recognized by the United States and diplomatic representatives of Latvia still receive full diplomatic recognition in Washington, D.C.

Americans must insist that their leaders continue to act in this courageous manner and work toward the freedom of the Latvian people. We must remind the Soviets that we will not forget their vicious act of aggression against the Baltic States and that we will not tolerate any further such aggression. Because freedom is a right given to man by God, it is imperative that the United States continue to be its champion.

GOLD STAR MOTHER

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, the mother of a young South Dakota soldier killed during the Vietnam war recently sent me a poem she has written describing the loss a mother feels when her son goes to war and does not return.

It is a very beautiful and poignant poem that is especially appropriate in light of the recent tragedy in Beirut and the loss of American lives in Grenada. I would like to share the poem with my colleagues.

GOLD STAR MOTHER

Wasn't it only yesterday
You held him to your breast?
You thanked the Lord in Heaven,
For being so greatly blessed.

As soon as you were left alone,
You removed his infant clothes,
With fear and pride you counted
All the little fingers and toes.

Yesterday those fingers etched
Paths in the fresh-iced cake,
Left telltale frosting on his cheek
From the prize cake you had baked.

Yesterday tabby hadn't a chance,
His tail was so inviting,
Though admonished, "Now, don't pull his tail,"
He still found it exciting.

Then yesterday you saw him,
A boy become a man,
Straight and proud in the uniform
Of dear old "Uncle Sam".

"Don't worry, Mom, I'll be OK,
And I'll write every day."
and he did write and photos send,
You treasure these today.

Then a Gold Star Mother you became,
And yesterday you did sorrow;
But yesterday isn't so long ago.
It's the day before tomorrow.

—MARGARET M. BARROW.●

SORROW FOR OUR YOUNG MEN KILLED IN BEIRUT AND GRENADA

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 17, 1983

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I and many of my colleagues recently returned home to our respective districts to attend the funerals and memorial services for the brave young men who died in the invasion of Grenada and the attack on our Marine headquarters in Beirut, Lebanon.

I attended two such services in my district. One was a funeral service for Jeffrey Boulos of Islip and the other was a memorial service for Kenneth John Butcher, a 27-year-old from my hometown, West Islip. These two deaths have touched my district, but all of the deaths of our servicemen have touched us as a nation. There are many families grieving, as a nation is grieving. From the outpouring of emotion which I have witnessed by the many calls and letters I have received, it is obvious that they are deeply sorrowful, yet proud of these young Americans who deserve our tribute; they deserve to be honored.

I am deeply saddened at the recent loss of so many young Americans who gave of themselves so unselfishly to serve this Nation. It is the first time in quite some time that we have lost so many American lives through service duty. It is tragic, since one loss is one too many.

There are few words of comfort that we can offer the families of those who recently died. Too often we take for granted the young men and women who serve to protect our freedom and liberty. Freedom and liberty are not free. We are forced to guard them in order to protect the way of life we hold so dear. We are a great nation because we are a great people.

On behalf of the House of Representatives, I would like to express the grief we feel and extend our deepest condolences to all of the families who are grieving at this time. it is a time of sorrow. It is a time of reflection. It is a time to remember.●